

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1848.

---

ART. I.—*Hints on Glass-Painting.* By AN AMATEUR. Oxford:  
John Henry Parker. 1847.

A WORK of such pretensions as the one whose title stands at the head of this article, devoted entirely to the subject of glass-painting, suggests at once more than one important reflection independent of and previous to any judgment of the merits of the work itself. In the first place it is an indication that the spirit of revival in matters of ecclesiastical decoration is not extinct nor waning; in fact, although in some cases eccentric and extravagant efforts, resulting from the uncertainty necessarily attending the first steps of a radical change, may have given an uninviting aspect to the movement, there is enough of right and solid principle in it to ensure it some stability. We say it is an evidence of continued progress in *ecclesiastical* taste, because, however general the application of stained glass to ornamental purposes may be, there can be no doubt that the actual demand for its use in churches, as well as the higher quality of the work required, points out all secular employment of the art as secondary and subordinate. As for the taste itself, it may be stigmatized as visionary and unreal, or as dangerous and seductive; all such assaults it will survive, and its strongest symptoms of health and vitality consist in the daily extension of its influence among persons too much opposed in views to have adopted it as a party watchword. The charge of unreality rests on the belief that acts of church-restoration and adornment have only in view the indulgence of a taste or humour. Now if by this is meant a purely selfish indulgence, we do not believe the case is a common one where the sacrifice is liberal. If, however, its opponents mean merely that the enjoyment of the result, apart from a sense of duty, more than repays the devotion of a church-restorer, we will only say that the weakness, if it be one, is at least too amiable to be discouraged. If we knew any man who thought it worth while to sell that he had and give to

the poor, we should hardly be disposed to depreciate his act on the ground that he expected to increase rather than diminish his temporal happiness by the sacrifice—in short, that with him alms-giving was only a *hobby*. And why should that which is offered directly to God in church-decorations be the only kind of charity which does not bless the giver?

But another reflection somewhat less trite, and more immediately connected with the subject in hand, arises from the fact of an amateur attaching himself, so peculiarly as the author of this work must have done, to a single and distinct branch of medieval art. Now in this exclusive following out of one vein in the mine of antiquity lies, we imagine, both the secret of all high attainments in art, and the seed of all decay. Without it no one branch will ever come near perfection, and yet in it lurks the worm which attacks the fruit still short of maturity. There may be, for instance, and there certainly are, men who practise simultaneously, with success, several distinct branches of church-decoration; but it will be found that the natural gifts proper to each, with the means of cultivating and supporting all by acquired knowledge, are seldom combined in one person in sufficient degree to rise very far above mediocrity. This is not refuted by instances such as those of Michael Angelo and Leonardo da Vinci, men who in their own persons served as the guides of the age in architecture, painting, sculpture, mechanics, mathematics and anatomy, simultaneously. These were giants whom no one looks for again, luminous bodies from which the arts once radiated, never to be reunited. And even they, with all their success in these arts severally, were examples of our other position—instances of that law of nature by which the arts, once developed, cease to act in harmony. Of course, however, this is less observable in such rare instances of concentration than in the coalition of different arts practised by different professors, each professor making the most of his own art, each art struggling for the first place, with no subordination such as is required to combine them in one symmetrical body. Thus it was only while the assistant arts were undeveloped that architecture, the master art, could mould them to submission in its service. Painting shook off its allegiance, renounced conventionally, and all its obedience to what was not nature, though it might be something more; and though the immediate result was seen in the productions of the 'divine' Raffaele, it was a rebellious divinity: painting was no longer the handmaid of architecture, nor, in a short time, of Religion. Sculpture, again, while contented with retirement in a gothic niche, not seeking to be prominent, exposed, and great, but purely supplementary to architecture, served that art efficiently without raising its



own professors to great eminence. But sculpture too climbed to the position of an independent and perfected art, and then ceased to aid the source which gave it birth. Hence it seems as if each art demands an exclusive and unreserved devotion to bring it to a degree of excellence, which, when attained, breaks it from the parent stem like an overlaid branch of fruit, and that a well-proportioned system of the arts in their highest state is not granted for the embellishment of the church on earth.

Now there is a connexion between all these remarks and the work we are discussing, though our readers may have sought it hitherto in vain. We have stated them as an introduction to, and, perhaps we may say, an apology for, certain positions of the author, which may seem unsatisfactory to some who yet must consider the opinions of one so deeply versed in his subject as authoritative. We think that, though the author's views, on the whole, appear deliberate, well-grounded, and just, still an amateur devoted peculiarly to one branch of art, and to whom, as we may suppose, the interests of that one branch are paramount, cannot complain if his statements are taken *cum grano salis* by those whose survey of art, though less minute, is more general and comprehensive. At the same time, so carefully are the opinions of this book supported by observation and reasoning, that a hasty dissent is not unlikely to be reversed upon an examination of the facts and arguments adduced.

The work is divided into two principal divisions, viz. I.—Rules to point out the leading distinctions of the various styles of glass-painting, and, II. Observations on the present state of the art, and suggestions for its application to particular purposes, and as to the best means for its advancement. At the very outset, the author, (in the preface), gives some intimation of the way in which he intends to limit the connexion between the first and second divisions of his subject, when he asserts that 'it is an error to suppose that glass-painting cannot be properly 'exercised now without a strict recurrence, in all respects, to the 'practice of the middle ages.' The division of styles adopted follows Mr. Rickman's Architectural Nomenclature for the most part, commencing with the early English style, which includes what little Norman glass exists, followed by the decorated and perpendicular periods, with the addition of the Cinque Cento style, (that of the 16th century), and what is here called the Intermediate style—that is, the period of unsuccessfully-attempted revival of the older styles, which is the questionable boast of our own times.

Now each of these periods had its own method of execution on which its distinctive effect depended, and these methods

resulted, not only from variety in the use made of the material, but also from variety in the material itself. So that in the first place we must avail ourselves, to a certain extent, of the author's very practical and complete knowledge of the more mechanical part of the art. And, as a fitting introduction to this part of the subject, we will quote, with a very hearty assent, the adage which is chosen as the motto of the work—'Proba est materia, si probum adhibeas artificem.' Let no one consider the brittle material here treated of as even comparatively insignificant, or unworthy of the strict and jealous regard which our author claims for it.

Glass in its original manufactured state is either white or coloured. Coloured glass is either what is called *pot-metal*, that is, coloured throughout its entire substance, or coated glass, which is white glass covered with a coat, more or less thick, of pot-metal colour. The beautiful deep-red or ruby-glass, brought to such perfection in the middle ages, and so unapproachable in ours, is commonly of the latter sort, other colours generally of the former. In some of the styles, however, coloured effects are produced by neither of these kinds, but by painting or staining glass originally white. This is done either by stains which are transparent and penetrating, or by enamels which are opaque, and applied merely superficially, like oil-colours, though they are afterwards fixed by burning.

Such being the variety in the material itself, the methods of employing it are equally various and distinct. There is the mosaic method, in which fragments of uniformly-coloured glass are cut to the forms required, and combined with the aid of lead into a transcript of the artist's design, with little employment of any colouring-matter besides. There is the enamel method, in which glass originally white is employed, and the design painted upon it and burnt in. Thirdly, there is a combination of these two, called the mosaic-enamel method, in which the broader and more positive masses of colour are formed by inserted pieces of coloured glass, and the remainder executed after the enamel method.

The character which the author gives of these several methods is worth observing. The mosaic system, he says, is admirably adapted to the nature of the material, but unsuited for *mere* picturesque effect, the colouring being produced by broad pieces of glass whose tints can scarcely be varied either in the lights or shadows, which imparts to works executed in this style the flat and hard, though brilliant character of an ancient oil-painting. The prevalence of the enamel method he considers to have arisen from the revival of art in the six-

teenth century, and the efforts then achieved in oil-painting. The glass-painters of that day ' strove to render their own art more completely an imitation of nature, and to produce in a *transparent* material the atmospheric and picturesque effects exhibited by the *reflective* surfaces of oil and fresco-paintings. The glass-paintings of this style lost in transparency what they found in variety of tint ; and in proportion as their picturesque qualities were increased by the substitution of enamel colouring for coloured glass, their depth of colour sensibly diminished.'

Now without assigning that precise limitation of each of these methods to its own period which may be found in the work itself, or defining the proportions in which they were combined at different times, it will be safe to say that the earliest specimens are the most strictly mosaic, and that the increasing use of enamels to give a greater finish to the paintings marks all the later styles, though a purely enamel style was not introduced before the latter half of the 16th century. The author, as might be expected from any one whose tastes have been formed from mediæval models, professes a preference for the mosaic above the other methods. With this preference, and after his disparaging remarks upon the enfeebling refinements which grew up with the increasing ambition to make windows independent works of art, with a more perfect pictorial effect than the early specimens, the reader would be disposed to fix the period of the author's choice at least somewhere previous to the 16th century. We shall find, however, such a conjecture erroneous.

But before we can even form any judgment of the author's principle of selection, we must make a cursory comparison of the styles of glass-painting from which he had to choose, according to the characteristics which he himself assigns them. The general features of the early English style are these. The windows consist of either coloured glass arranged in pictures, or white glass in patterns, surrounded by a border in either case. Coloured windows in this style are perfect mosaics, with a rich, gem-like effect, and exclude light more than any others. The design appears undefined at a distance, with something of the characters of a Turkey-carpet pattern. The glass is commonly arranged either in medallions, or in the form of single figures under canopies. Pattern windows in what is called white glass, are brilliant and silvery in appearance, and are composed of either quarries, that is, diamond-shaped pieces, each bearing a small pattern, or of foliage drawn on white glass and disposed in various forms furnished with borders. The foliage itself is conventional, and resembles the sculptured foliage of the same style. Great mechanical skill and ingenuity is displayed by the

artists in several points. For instance, figures at a great elevation are exaggerated in height to counteract the shortening effect of perspective. This certainly seems to indicate something more than sheer ignorance of perspective as a motive for the conventional drawing of early English times. The arrangement of the lead-work and iron frames (in medallion windows) affords further evidence of both artistic and mechanical dexterity. The general merits of the style are thus summed up by the author: 'Notwithstanding their rudeness and defective drawing, the early English windows in general possess great merit. Simple and unaffected, they are often grandly conceived, though they may be imperfectly executed. A deep and lively feeling often pervades the entire figure, and its countenance, though exaggerated, exhibits expression and character. The early English artists were happy in their representations of deified and sainted personages.' And in allusion to the narrow lancet windows of this style, he says, 'The intensity of colours in windows diminished as the number and size of the windows themselves increased.' There is certainly a general approbation in this account, which hardly prepares us for the deliberate and unreserved rejection of the style, afterwards proclaimed. Windows of the decorated period assumed a less mosaic and more lively character, which is attributed partly to the introduction of the yellow stain at the beginning of the 14th century, which imparted a paler and more lemon-like tint than the pot-metal yellow glass which had been in use before. Severe drawing still characterized the figures, but of a more refined nature than that of the preceding style, and dignified by ample and flowing draperies. The foliage is natural, so as to be easily recognised, and the dark outlines of the design become less coarse and heavy than in the earlier specimens.

In the period which followed, that of the perpendicular style, began that fatal diminution in the intensity of tints, which, more and more encouraged as the artists' ambition of pictorial effect increased, ended at last in the washy imbecility of the purely enamel method. Still it was long before the subordination of glass to the architectural members of the building was so entirely lost sight of as it was in days when mullions and tracery were unsparingly swept away to make room for the broad divisions of a feeble transparency. The glass-stainer did what he could to force his art into prominence, without proceeding to this violence; his figures were expanded to nearly the full width and height of the respective lights they occupied, but the stone divisions of those lights circumscribed their growth, and the consequence of this half acknowledgment of their subordination was, a disproportion in the figures themselves,

caused by their adaptation to the space allotted them, which made them low and squat. They were distinguished, however, by a repose, and freedom from forced or extravagant attitudes, which had not accompanied the bold, severe, and spirited drawing of the earlier styles. The grand characteristic of perpendicular glass, says the author, is delicacy, sometimes bordering on timidity, and general breadth of effect. And, he admits, the windows of this period lost in power what they gained in refinement. The foliage retrograded from the approach to nature made in decorated times, without recovering the crisp outline and bold effect of early English work. On the whole, the author does not seem to have much to say in favour of the perpendicular period; certainly not enough to support an assertion of its superiority to what preceded it.

Concurrently with the close of the perpendicular period in England, arose on the continent the Cinque Cento style, and afterwards prevailed for a time in our own country. Of this style it is as well to say at once, that the author of the work we are examining considers it the golden age of glass-painting, and still further limits this period of prosperity to the years between 1525 and 1535, during which it flourished in greatest perfection. So far as we discern, he gives it this preference solely on the ground of its more refined and correct drawing. In almost all other points it seems inferior to its predecessors. Windows of this date, though chiefly constructed on the mosaic system, have a less mosaic appearance than the earlier ones. The positive colours are qualified by the introduction of tints of less power and vivacity. An effect of distance and atmosphere was attempted, and, pictorially considered, the attempt was successful, but qualities much more valuable, as accessories to the building, were sacrificed for it. With all the finish of this style, there appears to have been a want of mechanical skill in some respects when compared with that of earlier times. For instance, the utmost pains were taken, we are told, to glaze the paintings so as to *conceal* the leads. How much more artistic was the employment of the leads in every intricate and graceful form, as the outline of the design itself, with the iron frames necessary to the stability of such a surface as a large early English lancet presents, wrought into the beautiful medallion forms into which the glass itself was composed! Least of all can the minor details of the style furnish the author's grounds of preference. The ornaments consist of foliage &c. intermixed with *genii*, *Cupids*, and angels, vases, candelabra, fruit, wreaths, festoons, cords and tassels! There would require at least some selection to fit them for the purposes of church-decoration. On the other hand, it is but fair to give, in the author's own

warm terms of commendation, his opinion of the drawing and colouring in use at this time. 'In technical knowledge of the 'human figure,' he says, 'the glass-painters of this period certainly surpassed their predecessors, and their successors likewise. Its form and proportions are in general well preserved in their work, and their pictures are often as well executed as 'designed, a matter of very rare occurrence in glass-painting.' And in spite of the decrease in depth and brilliancy of colours, which he acknowledges as a characteristic of the style, he says elsewhere, that during the ten years mentioned above, 'Cinque 'Cento glass-paintings display in general the most gorgeous 'effects of colours, and the greatest contrasts of light and shade, 'that have hitherto been attained in painted glass without sacrificing the transparency of the material.' He traces 'the 'superior pictorial qualities of the glass-paintings of the first 'half of the sixteenth century' to the progress made at that period in fresco and oil-painting. Finally, he concludes that during this period glass-painting reached a degree of excellence 'which has not only never since been equalled, but also affords 'a satisfactory ground for the belief that if glass-painting 'cannot boast of possessing examples as full of artistic merit 'as the works of the great masters, this deficiency is attributable not to any inherent incapacity in this system of 'painting for a display of high art, but simply to the want 'of skill in those who have hitherto practised it.'

The so-called 'Intermediate' style, which is in fact no distinct style at all, but only a period of attempted revival, seems for that reason hardly to be numbered among the progressive styles from which our author had to make his choice. Still its characteristics do bear upon his views, because they illustrate the result of imitating ancient examples at all. At all events, this part of the work is worth notice here, as pointing out and accounting for the errors into which modern glass-painters have commonly fallen. The author does not flatter the artists of his own day. 'Modern imitations of 'the ancient style are,' he says, 'distinguished by a display 'of the imperfect drawing of the ancient artists without any 'of their feeling or inspiration.' 'The erroneous notion that 'nothing besides brilliancy of colour is required in a glass-painting has engendered the cultivation of a low species of 'art, and the servile imitation of the grotesque and extravagant 'drawing of the middle ages.' Against this truly Chinese fidelity of imitation he justly protests, though he does not appear to have a very clear apprehension of a more liberal principle. The French are said to employ higher artistic talents in the pursuit than ourselves, and consequently to



be more successful in catching the spirit of their models. But it is not want of taste or skill alone which makes our rescripts of ancient models so unsuccessful. Physical causes are leagued against us. For instance, the very rudeness and defective working of the machinery employed in the manufacture of ancient glass was a source of beauty when it was used for ornamental purposes. The flimsy, though unblemished material of our own day is far less effective than the thick, rugged, coarse, uneven, half-opaque substance which was the vehicle of rich, deep colours in the middle ages. Still we suppose there is an analytical process by which the progressive improvements in the manufacture of glass may be made to retrograde, till a voluntary rudeness is reached for this special purpose, leaving the refinements of modern invention available for ordinary use. We are not aware whether this has been tried.

While on the subject of modern imitations, the author gives his view of the causes which led to the decay of the art at the close of his favourite style. 'Glass-painting,' he says, 'deteriorated not in consequence of any want of encouragement, for the causes of its decline were in full operation at the period of its greatest prosperity, [the Cinque Cento style, we presume,] but from confounding its principles with those of other systems of painting, from a disregard of its peculiar conditions and distinctive character.' In short, its decline was the natural issue of that principle of decay which, as we have intimated, all art inherits, and which naturally shows itself just at the time when any branch of it has put forth its full power of growth. Perhaps it was hardly necessary to assure the public that 'the Reformation did not corrupt the art, and that the mosaic system of glass-painting would equally have been forgotten had it never taken place.'

Having completed his survey of the styles, the author, or, in place of a somewhat wearisome circumlocution, Mr. Winston, (for it is hardly presumptuous, we believe, thus to interpret the initials at the end of the preface) looks at them collectively in order to make his selection, and pronounce, *ex cathedra*, (for there is no English writer of equal pretensions on the subject) what style church-builders and church-restorers shall adopt. We can fancy that he must have done so with considerable embarrassment, judging both from his manner of considering the subject throughout, and from the conclusion to which he comes. He seems persuaded that the earlier styles exhibit brilliancy and depth of colour, with grandeur of conception and general solemnity of character, all however inseparable from preposterous and outrageously false drawing. On the other hand, in the latest of all genuine



styles, he discerns correct drawing and unshackled pictorial display, not unattended, certainly, with a deterioration in tints, and (though he says, and appears to think, little of this point,) with a disregard of the architectural members to which it should be subordinate. Having attained this conviction, he next determines that edification and all the higher objects of the art require that good drawing should be the primary consideration, and therefore that if any ancient style be reproduced, it ought to be the Cinque Cento. But Mr. Winston (as might be expected) is only relatively satisfied with this (perhaps the genii and Cupids, the festoons and tassels of the style are perplexing to him), and he boldly resolves to cut the knot by recommending *no* ancient style for general use, but clearing a path for one entirely new. Accordingly, with many apologies for his originality, he proceeds to throw out suggestions for the formation of a new style. And first he endeavours, as a preliminary step for his own guidance, to investigate the principles which should be kept in view by a painter on glass. His first proposition is excellent. An artist, he says, ought to endeavour to develop the resources of his particular branch of painting to the fullest extent, but not to seek excellences which are incompatible with its inherent properties. The translucency of glass-painting enables it to display effects of light and colour beyond all other modes, but the same quality involves certain defects, *e. g.* a limited scale of colours and an inherent flatness for want of transparent shadow. Another peculiarity, *viz.* its mechanical construction with respect to lead-work and saddle-bars, excludes several applications of design, for instance, landscapes (except in back-grounds) long perspective views of interiors, fore-shortened groups, &c. These peculiarities must be either evaded or turned to account. The painter is bound to exhibit the translucency of glass, which is easily done in patterns, but far more difficult in pictorial designs, but, at the same time with the translucency, he must display the effect of atmosphere and distance. So, at least, says Mr. Winston, and proposes to accomplish it by using clear lights, transparent (stippled) shadows, strong contrasts of light and shade, and, lastly, narrow leads, which he recommends even at the risk of sacrificing security from weather. All these, however, may be recovered from the ancient styles, and therefore the necessity of a new one must arise only from the requirements of the design in outline.

After so grave an investigation of first principles, the reader will be disposed to expect more originality in Mr. Winston's professedly new style than he is likely to find. So far as we can understand a somewhat indistinct course of suggestions, his plan goes no further than the adoption of the exist-

ing styles respectively, in all their leading features, according to the date of the building in which they are to be embodied, with such a transmutation as would result from rectified drawing, and some few other emendations of less importance. Now surely, even granting that an attention to these points would create any considerable deviation from ancient precedents, this is hardly to set up a new style, any more than if an architect should build a church, following in its outline models of the twelfth or thirteenth century, but aided in its execution by the newly-invented instruments and improved manual skill of our own times. But the truth is, as we believe, that correct drawing, &c. would not really effect any change in the true character of ancient glass-painting at all. The author himself takes special pains to impress upon us that incorrect drawing is no essential element in the spirit of the ancient styles, but a mere accidental deficiency. And we have the authority of one not less learned in the subject than even Mr. Winston, and more practically acquainted with it—one whose attainments in the art have gained him the highest patronage which France, his own country, can bestow—for saying that those who search for the very best examples, such as are the real types of their respective styles, will find the most excellent drawing in the early periods. M. Gerente, in his recent visit to this country, has displayed a depth of information which makes him no despicable ally to those who, with him, are disposed to maintain the thirteenth century as the true golden age of glass-painting, against Mr. Winston with his devotion to the sixteenth. If, then, even accurate and beautiful drawing is among the attributes of the early styles, what becomes of Mr. Winston's cry for change on the plea of inferiority in this respect? *Parturiunt montes*: we cannot see that his suggestions amount to anything like the sketch of a new style.

If necessary, it is quite possible to take considerable liberties with the ancient styles, and it may be advantageous to introduce new forms and features as well as to refine upon the old. Nay more, it would not be very difficult, as the last half century has shown, to design windows entirely without regard to any precedent whatever. And this method of proceeding would certainly be new, so far as any reverence for antiquity is concerned, though its ignorance and lawlessness are, we imagine, prominent characteristics of the whole course of our author's 'Intermediate style.' But even if we had no results of the system before us as warnings, it would be a bold and incongruous experiment, since we do not profess to abandon all precedent in the composition of the structure itself which the glass is designed to adorn. This method, however, it is fair

to say, is very far from what the author proposes. He has a vague idea of the growth of a new eclectic style of universal application out of the several distinct styles of antiquity, combining the merits and rejecting the faults of all, without being classed under any one. Now we think this cannot well be. Glass-painting must be subordinate, and cannot be independent. The painter has not to design a picture, but to adorn a building, and that building will either be an ancient one, or a new one formed on the principles of the old. Hence there will not only be associations in the general aspect of the place demanding a chronological conformity in the glazing of the windows, but the very construction of the fabric—the hard, unbending masonry, will limit or expand the design, according to the style, in such a way as to make as strong a line of demarcation between periods in glass as in stone. At least, if the character of the different architectural styles be at all observed in glazing, we cannot ourselves realize such a consanguinity between the design for an early lancet and a broad perpendicular seven-light window, as can bring them together as examples of one and the same style. There seems to be some confusion in the author's mind between refinements upon an old style and the origination of a new one. When an entirely new style in architecture is started, it may be attended by an equally original movement in glass-painting; but any such movement would be premature if designed to introduce novelty into one portion of a structure substantially unchanged.

Admitting, however, that defective drawing is not so inseparable from early examples as to put them out of the pale of imitation, and that M. Gerente's view of the period of perfection in glass-painting is more just than Mr. Winston's, backed, as the former is, by a triumphant appeal to our own Cathedral of Canterbury, still there is scope enough for genius and judgment in modern artists. Even if in design we closely follow existing precedents, there is sufficient variety among them to exercise at least the faculty of selection. For instance, there is no one style, we suppose, from Norman to Cinque Cento, which does not in some measure allow us the option (no unimportant one) of employing either groups in action, or single figures. Again, though the figures of the different periods respectively have a peculiar and distinctive character, of repose in one case, of more excited action in another, still this is not so indispensable to the propriety of the style selected that any deviation in obedience to individual taste amounts to an innovation in style. Here, then, are two points, at any rate, fairly open to discussion; points, too, of considerable interest and importance, since they influence not only the mere pictorial

effect of a window, but also the amount and character of the edification which may result from the contemplation of it. Yet these points, and all questions connected with the composition of glass-painting, are omitted by our author on the ground that they do not fall within the province of an amateur. (Preface, p. 5.) This is a view which we cannot quite apprehend. For our own part, we should have considered that such questions of taste and propriety fell far more within the jurisdiction of an amateur than the dry though important facts, and profusion of technical details, which our author has collected with such incredible patience and perseverance.

The two questions which have presented themselves to us, out of many which might arise, are really less distinct than they may appear at first sight to be. The alternative of groups or single figures involves in a considerable degree that of repose or action. A group must be actually historical, or, at least, possess so much action as to connect the figures with one another. On the other hand, violent action in a single figure is unintelligible, except by an extraordinary effort of the imagination.

Reducing these, therefore, to one question, it is obvious that historical groups or figures in action will operate upon the spectator otherwise than single figures, and those in attitudes of repose, or such conventional postures as do not require that the imagination should supply other figures to join in the action, and consider the scene as one directly historical. The former would edify undoubtedly, for pictures are the poor man's books, and they would impress upon the mind historical events and even doctrinal facts of which he might otherwise be ignorant. Nor would this effect be confined to the unlettered. The most refined and intellectual among us may with advantage be made to realize what we have learnt, by seeing it thus embodied, if the design is correctly conceived and faithfully executed. It cannot, therefore, be desirable entirely to exclude historical groups, such as the scenes of the Gospel, or of Church history, from glass-painting. Still we conceive that this sort of edification is not its highest function. A church is not, except secondarily, a place of instruction: 'My house is the house of prayer.' Hence we consider that the proportion of directly historical representations should not be greater than that of catechetical instruction in our systems of devotion to the portions designed for meditation and prayer. A solitary figure offered to our contemplation, not *acting* its history, but tranquilly indicating it by some conventional symbol; not seeking to refresh our memory, but to stimulate our devotion and provoke our zeal,—harmonizes most with the solemn purpose of

a consecrated building. We do not gain from representations of even the noblest actions of the lives of saints an equally high sense of the change which has taken place in those who have gone before us as examples, with that which results from their mysterious influence when drawn up, as it were, in inactive, passionless rows, watching ceaselessly and unwearied the devotions of those who are ever less ready to pray than God to hear. These latter teach us more truly the relation between the departed and ourselves.

'The Saints are there, the Living Dead,  
The Mourners glad and strong;  
The sacred floor their quiet bed,  
Their beams from every window shed  
Their voice in every song.'

*Lyra Innocentium (Church Windows).*

The terrible details of a martyrdom, for instance, call our thoughts indeed to the sufferer, and awaken a due admiration of his fortitude, a due abhorrence of his persecutors' malice. But the still effigy, divested of all action connected with the events and conduct of life on earth, and shadowing, so far as is lawful, the condition of life in heaven—the face cleared from all emotion and all sense of self—the attitude of benediction or warning concerning those who remain behind—all these point with peculiar precision and impressiveness to the preparation we must enter upon for the things to come.

When we have made our determination respecting the adoption of groups or single figures, when we have resolved on the degree of historical action which our figures shall display, there yet remain several questions to be considered either in borrowing from ancient examples or in original design. There is the great question, what the subject of the design shall be, what must be excluded on principles of faith or taste, and what will best serve the highest purposes of the art. We call it a great question, because obviously upon a right decision must depend the worth of the art itself, and its influences for good or evil. At the same time, we believe that both the current feeling and traditionary usage are sufficient to preclude the necessity of very stringent directions on this head; and therefore it is that we could wish omitted from the work such passages as treat the subject in a theological and controversial point of view. We allude chiefly to the chapter 'On the employment of painted glass as a means of decoration,' in which our author seems to display a less sense of the modesty becoming an amateur in theological matters than he professes as an amateur in glass-painting. His theology is, however, of a very negative character, consisting chiefly of fine-drawn objections, nice distinctions,

and strong protests against rather visionary evils. Protesting, indeed, seems to be his special delight. A painted window, he says, 'in a *Protestant* church, should be of a *Protestant* character, and accordingly free from those legends and symbols for which *Protestants* have neither reverence nor belief.' If the reverence and belief of a Protestant majority is exacted, the glass-painter's catalogue of legends and symbols is likely to be a limited one indeed. We shall soon obtain our author's limitation of them in a more definite and tangible shape. He justifies the use of portraits of the saints, on the ground that 'no one can suppose that either portraits of saints or other scriptural subjects are introduced into a church with any other view than for the purpose of ornament, or, *possibly*, of example and instruction.' For our own part, we would not give much for an art which professes to serve the church with mere ornament; and that which Mr. Winston regards as a *possible* object, viz., food for meditation, and a source of example and instruction, seems to us the sole, legitimate, and adequate end for which the subject is worth cultivating, or, we had almost said, Mr. Winston's book worth reading. But even this not very bold concession to the claims of the saints to the services of Christian art is diluted with a further protestation. 'Against the representation of unscriptural subjects, there is in *Protestant* minds a general and well-founded objection.' At first we were disposed to quarrel with this restriction, in the fear that it would exclude such subjects as the proto-martyrdom of England from the churches of St. Alban—the dawn of Christianity upon our Saxon ancestors from those of St. Augustine, &c.; but upon further reading we were satisfied that the author's interpretation of a scriptural subject is a liberal one. He advocates a rule which 'gives free admission to the *Protestant* martyrs, and the Fathers of the Anglican Church;' though at the same time he prohibits (we presume as unscriptural) certain other 'objects, which, though not legendary, are hardly of a *Protestant* character.' These objects are 'the instruments of the Crucifixion, such as the nails, the hammer, the ladder, the scourge, the crown of thorns, &c.,' to which, he says, *Protestants* do not allow sufficient importance to justify the affectation of it by giving them a prominent place in our designs. We believe they do not. In the same vein of satire upon his own times, the author declares that his opinion is decidedly hostile to symbols, because 'to some persons they are offensive, to most they are unintelligible, and in very few, perhaps, of those who do understand their meaning, are they capable of awakening any sentiments of piety or veneration;' because, 'if any interest attaches to ancient symbols, it is an antiquarian interest,' and



because 'we know that the modern copies are an unreal 'mockery, the production not of a congenial mind, but a mere 'mechanical hand.' Severe as this sarcasm is, (and surely we cannot be wrong in regarding this language as no other than a piece of delicate but cutting irony) it is a relief, after the dry technical details which form the substance of this amateur production.

But before we draw to a conclusion, there are some points remaining which seem to deserve discussion, although there is little to suggest them in the volumes before us, perhaps because they seem to approach too nearly the question of composition and design, which Mr. Winston considers that an amateur is bound to relinquish. In the case of figures, for instance, the disposition and character of the drapery are worth considering, since on them will greatly depend the solemnity and propriety of the painting. Now, while we agree with our author that we are under no obligation to follow closely the drawing of ancient glass-paintings, we must be careful to distinguish between peculiarities founded on principle, and those which are the result of accident or imperfect knowledge and manual skill; and therefore we should be sorry to consider as an open question the proportion which drapery should bear to the figure in extent. It may be said, perhaps with truth, that the long flowing draperies of saints are purely conventional, and such as were not and could not be worn under the circumstances represented. But like the unnaturally tall figures in very elevated early English windows, this was no result of ignorance or want of skill. The reverential spirit of ancient painters revolted from an arrogant display of the limbs, from any unnecessary obtrusion of the humanity of their subjects. The same, in almost the same degree, is exhibited in the more devotional pictures of Raffaele,—and who can charge *him* with ignorance or want of skill? Majestically draped as many of his figures are, every limb was first drawn naked in the painter's studio, nay, every muscle was assigned to its place with consummate anatomical knowledge; and when the figure stood veiled before the vulgar eye, no defective drawing was hidden, no negligence excused by that reverential treatment of the subject. In our own times, the painter who brings a smattering of anatomy to his aid, is uneasy if all are not reminded of the accomplishment thus accessory to his fame, and burns for naked subjects. There is a nauseous profanity in certain painters who choose a saint as a field for the play of a prurient imagination, and love to employ their pencil on reiterated forms of the humbled Magdalene, because it enables them to show their skill in imitating flesh. Those who have frequented the exhibitions of late years will not be at a



loss for an illustration of what we mean. But, setting aside the claims of religious veneration, as a mere act of policy, the glass-painter will clothe his figures in long and ample draperies, for he will scarcely meet with any greater mechanical difficulty in his art than the proper representation of flesh of large extent on glass. We trust, therefore, that this conventionality will never cease to be observed.

But the mere length of garments, though it may secure propriety, will not produce dignity. And it is the modern artist's province, by study and experiment, to attain to a majestic disposition of the folds of drapery. We cannot venture to suggest any rule on this head. Of course, something of severity will be acknowledged as required in an ecclesiastical painting; but this may be effected by the most opposite treatment. Let any one, for instance, set side by side some of Albert Durer's wood-engravings and the designs of Flaxman. In the former, (as in the German and Italian painters who preceded A. Durer), the folds are numerous, strongly marked, and angular. In Flaxman's figures the drapery is defined by very few bold but undulating strokes; yet in both of these there is a common element of severity. The same fact is displayed by a comparison of early ecclesiastical paintings with classical sculpture; yet, the study of the latter was greatly cultivated by the early painters, and their choice of a different method to produce somewhat the same effect is as difficult to be traced to a motive as it certainly commends itself in the result. One point in which the experience of the artist will be brought to bear upon this question will be, the distribution of light and shade. The sharp, small, frequent folds of ancient drapery would tend to scattered and unvaried light. How far this would be an evil in a transparent material we are not prepared to say.

The demand for memorial windows (happily an increasing one) suggests some difficulties which the glass-painter has to overcome peculiarly in this case. He will be expected to introduce at least some characteristic symbol of the person commemorated; and he ought to be well acquainted with all the ancient methods of accomplishing this by monograms, rebuses, merchants' marks, badges of trades and professions, patron saints, &c. But it is not improbable that he will also have occasion to pourtray the person of the deceased, and, perhaps, that of the donor of the window. In this case an immediate difficulty presents itself in the unsightliness of modern costume. It is true that the difficulty is not peculiar to this branch of art. It has evidently been the enigma of sculptors, painters, and artists in general for centuries past, that is, ever since the revival of pagan art in England. Hence it is that, whereas our statesmen

and generals have invariably argued or fought their way to distinction in swallow-tailed coats and trousers, their friends commonly consider them best commemorated in a bare neck, flowing toga, and sandals. Half of our metropolitan public statues, if they were gifted with a little more of the spirit and accuracy of classical sculpture, would seem likely to delude future generations into the belief that their originals were among the adventurers who came over, not, like our old English gentry, with William the Conqueror, but, somewhat earlier, with Julius Cæsar. And yet in the only case in which a conventional dress could be adopted with full propriety, that of ecclesiastics, to whom belongs of right an attire more solemn and picturesque than they commonly assume, this method of solving the problem seems never to have entered into the heads of artists. Chantrey, for instance, who clothes Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Wellington, so far as he clothes them at all, in a foreign and unmeaning garb, makes exertions, not less obvious than unsuccessful, to give dignity to the real costume of Bishop Heber and other bishops whom he has transmitted to posterity, as types of what a bishop is, externally at least, in our days. The mitre and staff, and all those vestments whose symbolical propriety is as inseparable from the episcopate now as when they were its ordinary garb, seem never to have occurred to him as materials ready to his hand for the due and decent representation of his subject. In the case of secular persons, however, the painter has still to grapple with the difficulties of modern costume. We need hardly protest against the unreality of returning to a more picturesque but inappropriate and exploded dress. On the other hand the colourless and shapeless vestments in which our limbs are commonly clad form no ornamental feature in a painted window. Where royalty, nobility, any office of state, or an academical position or degree, offers a peculiar and less vulgar costume, the difficulty is comparatively small; but very often these facilities will be withheld. In this case the figure should occupy a very subordinate position in the window, so as not to challenge notice, and a devotional attitude will go far to dignify any inevitable vulgarity.

Having noticed some unfavorable points in Mr. Winston's book, we will not withhold the great praise to which some parts of it are entitled. The care with which the illustrations have been executed is very praiseworthy. Nearly all are copied from actual tracings of the originals, either reduced or precise fac-similes. The author has not commonly availed himself of the labours of others, but examined, traced, and coloured, expressly for the work in hand. Even the quality of the material is often expressed in his illustrations, as, for instance, the streaky

appearance of ancient ruby-glass. But even the pictorial part of the volumes displays the same timid and low view of his task which forbids his giving any theory of composition and design, or anything beyond dry facts, with a few moral and theological sentiments. The examples chosen are not such as display the greatest beauty and purity, but those which best illustrate his descriptions of distinctions in manner of execution or mechanical peculiarities. After all, however, as we have before intimated, there is no other English book which can serve the same purpose as this is calculated to serve. And, so far as we have ascertained, the same may be said of foreign works on the subject. There are more splendid and more original publications, such as the yet incomplete one of M. Lasteyrie, and there are several recent French and German pamphlets upon stained glass, but this is the first attempt at a manual.

---

ART. II.—*The Expedition to Borneo of H.M.S. Dido, for the Suppression of Piracy: with Extracts from the Journal of JAMES BROOKE, Esq., of Sarawak, (now Her Majesty's Commissioner and Consul-General to the Sultan and independent Chiefs of Borneo.)* By CAPTAIN THE HON. HENRY KEPPEL, R.N. Third Edition. With an additional Chapter, comprising recent Intelligence, by WALTER K. KELLY. In 2 vols. London: Chapman & Hall. 1848.

THERE is a charm about the idea of a beautiful island which the imagination lays hold of with avidity. An insular position, either literally or metaphorically, gives intensity and vividness. Be a thing good or bad, beautiful or deformed, full of pleasant, happy thoughts, or fraught with terrors, it is the more so from being alone, for the imagination loves solitude, and delights in working out one idea undisturbed by a multiplicity of forces. The stranger, the widow, and the orphan, apart from higher motives, have ever been the subjects of poetic sympathy from the loneliness of their condition. Distress is aggravated by desolation; deformity is most hideous when made the mark of exclusion; while superstitious alarms are more quickly excited at the idea of one mighty, overwhelming creature of the fancy, stalking all in solitude and darkness, than by the thought of innumerable little imps, however troublesome and nasty they may be. Again, if we would apply the same argument to our notions of comfort and security, it is an obvious illustration to appeal to the idea of a man's home being his castle. Bars and bolts, forms and manners of society, and such exclusive influences add much to our domestic enjoyments. This is well described by Leigh Hunt in his amusing, though in some respects not very commendable work, 'Men, Women, and Books,' with regard to the furthest retreat of all in private life—the centre keep of the domestic castle we have alluded to. 'Bed is the home of home; the innermost part of the content. It is sweet within sweet; a nut in the nut; within the snuggest nest a snuggest nest; my retreat from the publicity of my privacy; my room within my room, walled (if I please) with curtains; a box, a separation, a snug corner, such as children love when they play at "house;" the place where I draw a direct line between me and my cares; where I enter upon a new existence, free, yet well invested; reposing, but

'full of power; where the act of lying down, and pulling the 'clothes over one's head, seems to exclude matters that have 'to do with us when dressed and on our legs.' We ascend, however, to more imaginary pictures—to scenes which we know more of from the indulgences of hope than from the gratification of experience. What is most often the local habitation of a child's poetic fancies? What was the blissful retreat of Homer's wandering hero? What is the Utopia of many speculations and many plans, political, economical, philosophical? What is the brightest dream to the weary of the world's cares and troubles? What is the passing fancy of many an enthusiastic moment? Is it not to find a pleasant island encompassed by the dark blue ocean—to wander from shore to shore through fertile plains, by the side of romantic streams, or under the bold outline of a mountain range: with or without company, how many, or of what sort, depending on circumstances, we need not discuss. But the question will next occur, Where should the island be? To the *excitable* inhabitants of Tipperary, perhaps it might appear that, if cleansed of the cowardly Saxons, and freed from the restraining obligations of rent, no colour would contrast so well with the before-mentioned ocean blue, as the bright Emerald Isle; but to quote in this case the words of a graver censure '*in hac parte nullam ejus fiduciam habemus*,' we like not the results which follow Tipperary excitement, and therefore do not recommend any, but such as in a very literal way are wearied with the busy world, to fix on Ireland as the realization of their Utopian aspirations.

We have moreover a decided admiration for a certain great luminary, which, in our humble judgment, exercises a powerful influence in brightening up the dull elements of which this earth is composed. Cheering as its inner strata may be to the speculating eye of the geologist, we yet feel confident that the particular part of it which is exposed to the light and heat of the sun will ever be most popular and most generally admired. If any one is inclined to be sceptical, let him descend the dark regions of a coal-pit, or even let him wander through limestone caverns with all their beauties of stalactites, stalacmites, and the many varieties of glistening spars; let him do this on a fine sunny day, and on emerging from below, let him cast his eyes around, and let him feel the warm beams of the sun. Then he will perceive what a glorious influence the sun has on all that meets its joyous face. In contrast with the dark, cold, and damp regions he has quitted, all will appear like fairyland; for a few brief moments he will think of Paradise, where every sense drinks in a spontaneous draught of most pleasing sensations. But to jump to our conclusion without further delay, we

think that the sunny climes of the tropics have the best claim to be the residence of such fairy-like islands as imagination pictures. The geography of the world seems to sanction our judgment. No part of the globe is so sprinkled with islands as the torrid zone; the slightest glance at a map will show almost a girdle of Oceanides from the eastern shore of Africa to the west of America; and between these two continents there are the West Indies, with many scattered isles from those of Cape Verd to St. Helena. The propriety of this is obvious; the sun, though wonderful in its effects, yet, like all other mechanical powers, requires something to work on, some material which it is to use as its instrument, some fulcrum to move the world. Its insatiable thirst demands oceans of water, if the land, which dares to look him point blank in the face, is to profit by such fiery contact. As in a steam-engine you must proportion the elements of fire and water to produce power, or even to avoid disastrous effects; so you must have water if the sun is to produce fertility, and you must have it in proportion to the sun's power. The vast and dreary deserts of central Africa are a monument of the destructive powers of heat where its thirst is unquenched. The temperate zones are undoubtedly the proper places for large continents, as on land removed from the equator the supply of water required is not so great, and also, it is allowed to accumulate. The only continent indeed, besides Africa, through which the equator runs, is South America, and its course is there followed by the mighty Amazon, with its thousand tributaries irrigating with no mean supply of water the whole breadth of the continent, from the lofty table-lands of the Cordilleras on the west, to the Atlantic on the eastern shore.

We know that in extolling a tropical climate, we are running counter to many dearly-bought opinions as to health and home comforts, and that we are also offending the poetical prejudices which linger round the succession of the seasons in the temperate regions of the earth. We like the modest budding of spring, the permanent luxuriance of a moderately hot summer, the richness of autumnal fruits, and the tints of departing verdure; we even cling, from the wholesome power of association, to the bitter frosts of winter; we would not willingly give up the cheerful fireside evenings, made doubly sweet by contrast with the external weather. Our religious prejudices are enlisted in favour of the temperate zones; we almost feel that we are morally tied to these regions—so shocking to the sensibilities would it be to sit down to the good fare of Christmas-day under the full blaze of a sun which made it requisite that all culinary operations, or even all the arrangements of a social party, should be conducted after quite a

•

different system. Nor are we disposed rashly to find fault with such views; they have much good feeling at the bottom of them, and it is very unnecessary that they should be interfered with where no practical object is in view. Yet we think it must be admitted by the most strenuous admirer of our temperate seasons, with all their agreeable associations, that many days of the year, even in happy England, are not the brightest which an imaginative mind could picture, if called on to describe an earthly paradise, or to luxuriate in eloquent phrases of the full beauty and fertility of nature. We have but to look up from our paper to behold an horizon but dimly visible betwixt earth and heaven, yet itself the only distinguishable outline to separate the misty drizzle above from the same below. But a small portion of the year does, in fact, realize the beauties we attribute to it in idea. Yet we do not find fault with this our climate; it has done noble service, and we wish it well: but, may not those who truly admire nature be excused if they praise other climes where her powers are more strongly developed?—where her vital essence is more vigorous and quick in its productive energies? If there is a wonder in the small acorn which becomes an oak; if there is beauty in the humble garland of flowers gathered from the hedge side; if there is luxuriance in the wooded hills that overhang some rippling stream; if there is splendour in a wide prospect of fertile lands, rich valleys, and bold, undulating forests, as seen over the foreground of a well preserved English country mansion; if there is beauty in all this, may not the more adventurous imagination of the soul be excused if one wishes to see the same lovely dame, who shows so fair a prospect fifty-three degrees north of the equator, revelling in the enjoyment of her own energetic freedom, under what may be called her high-pressure force?

Again, as regards health: there is no doubt that hot climates do not suit all European constitutions; nor is it to our point that they should, as we have no wish to encourage a general migration forthwith, as a simple-minded Dyak of Borneo proposed to Mr. Brooke; on the contrary, if our counsel were asked in a certain high quarter, we should decidedly recommend that Her Majesty had better pause before she undertakes such an expedition. Yet, we do not think that this objection is of such an insuperable nature as some may imagine. The tropical regions are not entirely composed of parched sandy deserts and deadly swamps: these are only the exceptions, and can be easily avoided in the countries we would at present call attention to.

The island of Borneo, so prominently under the notice of the public just now, in consequence of Mr. Brooke's achievements, is, in many respects, from the brilliant accounts we receive of it,



almost such an island as we have attributed to the dreams of fancy; we hear it called, the 'Eden of the eastern wave.'

It is not, indeed, quite small enough to be the wished-for retreat of a solitary misanthropist; compared with such individual romance, it is a vast continent; but if we look on it as likely to become an appendage to our own wide empire, it maintains its character of being strictly an island, and may claim all the poetic advantages which belong to that species of land. The natural advantages of an insular position, it certainly enjoys; for, though being on the equator itself, which pierces its very centre, it has no lack of water, both in the form of rivers and refreshing rains; these make the land fertile, almost to the satisfying of human cupidity, and also so moderate and regulate the heat of a tropical sun, as, from the idea which the book before us conveys, to render it perfectly habitable, or even in many situations a most delightful climate for European residents.

The peculiar advantages which the island of Borneo enjoys, we will enter into more fully as we proceed with our review of Mr. Brooke's Journal. A few prefatory remarks of our own on the subject of such islands generally, we have ventured to make, in order to bring the particular case before us under the notice of our readers in a manner to attract, rather than, as is too often the case, to repel a poetical view of the subject. Poetry, by which we understand high sentiment and true nobleness of action, is the element of all real improvement and all true civilization; and it is the utter want of this—the consideration only of what a certain school of philosophy would call the *material* in opposition to the *spiritual*—which has been the cause of the little progress which European colonization has made in the improvement of the natives. Grasping avarice has been proved by the Dutch, to be in the end most short-sighted policy. After long possession of many islands in the Eastern Archipelago, they have now but little hold over them, and have derived but little profit from them. But take our own lamentable treatment of islands and continents somewhat further south. When parts of Australia and Van Dieman's Land came into our possession, how did we use them? Did we estimate such fair gifts as we ought? did we look on them as about to become, through our government, the future scenes of noble and high deeds, or did we strive to make them provinces for the spread of Christ's Church, where all the blessings of time and eternity might take root downwards and bear fruit upwards? This we should say would have been the view with which Christian romance would instinctively have taught us to regard these extensions of our empire. But instead of this, we filled them

with our refuse, as we throw dirt together in a heap in the remotest part of our premises. We made them the sink of our vices, and peopled distant lands with men, who having been, from the nature of the case, violators of human and divine law during their home life—having been hardened and corrupted by the exposure of a public conviction and association with their brethren in crime, and having further been so located in those countries as to banish, humanly speaking, all hope of repentance—become at last such demons of iniquity as to make our own devices, that were meant for our good, to recoil on us to our hurt. Here again was a selfish and short-sighted expediency, in the treatment of distant lands placed by Providence under our control, proved at last to be bad policy. More righteous would it be in the beginning, and more politic would it be in the end, if, taught by experience, we were to regard new possessions with nobler sentiments than avarice or short-sighted political selfishness can suggest, and to look on ourselves as being entrusted with moral responsibilities. The first step in this higher treatment of what is bestowed upon us, will consist partly in higher views of the wonderful works of God in the material world; but chiefly the Christian principle of the honour due to all men, be they wild and savage, deceitful, or helpless—or, more difficult than all, be they obstinate in their hostility to our notions of improvement.

We now turn, however, from our own speculations and our own conclusions, to the well-weighed opinions and practical experience of Mr. Brooke. But first, we cannot forbear offering that gentleman our warmest testimony to the excellent spirit in which all his undertakings have been carried through. Mr. Brooke exemplifies the maxim that honesty is the best policy: honesty in his case, consisting in a very exact appreciation of what was morally due to himself, to his country, and to the native inhabitants with whom he had to deal, and that in most varied and difficult circumstances. He was on many occasions heroically brave; on others he might have been thought, if we knew not the result, almost apathetically patient; and throughout he was uniformly considerate, kind, and the sincere friend of all around him, especially of the oppressed. With the small means at his disposal but a few years ago, and the extreme absence of all hurry throughout his proceedings, he reminds us of the more praiseworthy of two characters described by the son of Sirach: ‘There is one that laboureth, and taketh pains, and maketh haste, and is so much the more behind. Again, there is another that is slow, and hath need of help, wanting ability and full of poverty; yet the eye of the Lord looked upon him for good, and set him up from his

'low estate.' He ever seems possessed with the true confidence that patience and courage in a good cause can alone give. Throughout his expedition, it is obvious that much of his success arose from the fact, that he was responsible to no one but himself, that he was entirely his own master. He was engaged in his own private adventure, and had only himself to look to; and thus he enjoyed a great advantage over a commissioned officer with his work marked out beforehand, and the feeling that he is accountable to higher powers for every step he takes, and is liable to be recalled for any misconstruction that may be put upon his actions. A man under such circumstances is always apt to be too anxious for active measures, even when his own consciousness would tell him that the desired end might be effected more surely, by letting things work out their own course under the gentle but sure influence of the moral power and resolute will well known to belong to his cause. The only way to bring out the powers of a man, is to place confidence in him to perform his appointed task. It is the sign of a great statesman, or a great leader in any cause, to show discrimination in his choice of agents, but having chosen them, to give them free scope for their talents: it is an inferior mind which prefers to have a band of humble instruments, over whom he may exercise a constant and irritating supervision. The latter system may often appear most business-like and most politic, indeed it is the principle of modern times; but the former, as it requires a higher mind for its centre—for we estimate an acute knowledge of character far higher than the most comprehensive powers of circumspection—so it is the policy of the more enlightened and disinterested exercise of authority. The only difficulty is, when you have to deal with an inferior race of men whom you really cannot trust. But this applies not to Englishmen. All experience has taught us, and Mr. Brooke has, in the quiet times of peace, given us noble confirmation, that an English gentleman, of good education and natural intelligence, possesses innate powers of a high order, which only require their opportunity to come forth. With such a class to choose from, we think that those in authority are without excuse, if they prefer the inferior though sometimes necessary principle of reposing very limited confidence in their agents.

Those of our readers who are acquainted with Prescott's 'Conquest of Peru,' will find much in the character of Pedro de la Gasca, as there drawn, which is applicable to our present purpose. That distinguished ecclesiastic, in undertaking his mission to pacify the turbulent condition of the newly conquered empire of Peru, in the first place required that absolute

power should be given him, even to blank papers impressed only with the royal sign manual. Thus armed, he felt that he could act as he thought best, without being harassed by continual instructions from the distant and excitable powers of his own country. His very first policy was such as would never have been acted on by one differently situated. He remained for months absolutely passive, as though he had crossed the Atlantic in vain; but he knew that his quiet influence was all the time preparing the way for a better state of things, more effectually than would immediate hostilities: he preferred patience to violence, and his reward was, that he most quickly arrived at the triumphant completion of his embassy, and was spared all the evils of a violent policy. Mr. Brooke was in so far a similar situation, that he was able to bide his own time, without fear of being recalled from any misconstruction of his actions, or without the temptation to gain favour at home by active measures and gallant exploits, ending only in self-display, when a quieter line would in the end be most efficacious. Prompt, resolute, and courageous when necessary, he yet preferred showing to the natives the more peaceful aspect of his national character: Would that, amid all the valiant achievements which have filled the annals of our country's foreign policy, there had been a greater proportion of peaceful victories! Many no doubt there have been, where our moral pre-eminence has taken the place of sword and bayonet; but those weapons of blood have been but too active, and where they have been used in any but the cause of just vengeance, we may boast indeed of a conquest over the bodies of men, but not over their hearts or souls.

For the benefit of those who may not be acquainted with the circumstances of Mr. Brooke's expedition, we will now, as much as possible in his own words, give an outline of that career which has brought him into notice. This outline shall be brief, for we hope afterwards to consider, as distinct topics, the passages of the book before us which refer to the physical nature of the island of Borneo, and also to the characters of its native inhabitants, especially as that may affect their ultimate conversion to Christianity.

In the year 1838, Mr. Brooke made a statement of his proposed object, which forms a most interesting appendix to Captain Keppel's book. The commencement of this we will extract here:—

‘The voyage I made to China opened an entirely new scene, and showed me what I had never seen before, savage life and savage nature. I inquired, and I read, and I became more and more assured that there was a large field of discovery and adventure open to any man daring enough to enter

upon it. Just take a map and trace a line over the Indian Archipelago, with its thousand unknown islands and tribes. Cast your eye over the vast island of New Guinea, where the foot of European has scarcely, if ever, trod. Look at the northern coast of Australia, with its mysterious Gulf of Carpentaria; a survey of which it is supposed would solve the great geographical question respecting the rivers of the mimic continent. Place your finger on Japan, with its exclusive and civilised people; it lies an unknown lump on our earth, and an undefined line on our charts! Think of the northern coast of China, willing, as is reported, to open an intercourse and trade with Europeans, spite of their arbitrary government. Stretch your pencil over the Pacific Ocean, which Cook himself declares a field of discovery for ages to come! Proceed to the coast of South America, from the region of gold-dust to the region of furs—the land ravaged by the cruel Spaniard, and the no less cruel buccanier—the scene of the adventures of Drake and the descriptions of Dampier. The places I have enumerated are mere names, with no specific ideas attached to them: lands and seas where the boldest navigators gained a reputation, and where hundreds may yet do so, if they have the same courage and the same perseverance. Imagination whispers to Ambition, that there are yet lands unknown which might be discovered. Tell me, would not a man's life be well spent—tell me, would it not be well sacrificed, in an endeavour to explore these regions? When I think on dangers and death, I think on them only because they would remove me from such a field of ambition, for energy, and for knowledge.

'Borneo, Celebes, Sooloo, the Moluccas, and the islands of the Straits of Sunda and Banka, compose what is called the Malayan group; and the Malays located on the sea-shores of these and other islands may with certainty be classed as belonging to one people. It is well known, however, that the interior of these countries is inhabited by various tribes, differing from the Malays and each other, and presenting numerous gradations of early civilisation; the Dyaks of Borneo, the papuans of New Guinea, and others, besides the black race scattered over the islands. Objects of traffic here as elsewhere present interesting subjects of inquiry; and whilst our acquaintance with every other portion of the globe, from the passage of the Pole to the navigation of the Euphrates, has greatly extended, it is matter of surprise that we know scarcely anything of these people beyond the bare fact of their existence, and remain altogether ignorant of the geographical features of the countries they inhabit. Countries which present an extended field for Christianity and commerce, which none surpass in fertility, rich beyond the Americas in mineral productions, and unrivalled in natural beauty, continue unexplored to the present day; and, in spite of the advantages which would probably result, have failed to attract the attention they so well deserve. The difficulty of the undertaking will scarcely account for its non-performance, if we consider the voluntary sacrifices made on the shrine of African research, or the energy displayed and the sufferings encountered by the explorers of the polar regions; yet the necessity of prosecuting the voyage in an armed vessel, the wildness of the interior tribes, the lawless ferocity of the Malays, and other dangers, would prevent most individuals from fixing on this field for exertion, and points it out as one which could best and most fully be accomplished by Government or some influential body.'—Vol. i. pp. 367, &c.

The conclusion of the same document is also most interesting, especially when we know of his final success.

'I cannot but express my regret, that from pecuniary considerations as well as the small size of the vessel, and the limited quantity of provisions she carries, I am unable to take a naturalist and draughtsman; but I should

always hail with pleasure any scientific person who joined me abroad, or who happened to be in the countries at the time; and I may venture to promise him every encouragement and facility in the prosecution of his pursuits. I embark upon the expedition with great cheerfulness, with a stout vessel, a good crew, and the ingredients of success as far as the limited scale of the undertaking will permit; and I cast myself upon the waters—like Mr. Southey's little book—but whether the world will know me after many days, is a question which, hoping the best, I cannot answer with any positive degree of assurance.'—Vol. i. p. 381.

Captain Keppel's sketch of Mr. Brooke's life previous to 1838 we also insert.

'But before illustrating these circumstances from his own journals, it may be acceptable to say a few words respecting the individual himself, and his extraordinary career. I am indebted to a mutual friend, acquainted with him from early years, for the following brief but interesting outline of his life; and have only to premise, that Mr. Brooke is the lineal representative of Sir Robert Vyner, Bart. and Lord Mayor of London in the reign of Charles II.: Sir Robert had but one child, a son, Sir George Vyner, who died childless, and his estate passed to his heir-at-law, Edith, his father's eldest sister, whose lineal descendant is our friend. Sir Robert was renowned for his loyalty to his sovereign, to whom he devoted his wealth, and to whose memory he raised a monument.

"Mr. Brooke was the second, and is now the only surviving son of the late Thomas Brooke, Esq., of the civil service of the East India Company; was born on the 29th April, 1803; went out to India as a cadet, where he held advantageous situations, and distinguished himself by his gallantry in the Burmese war. He was shot through the body in an action with the Burmese, received the thanks of the government, and returned to England for the recovery of his prostrated strength. He resumed his station, but shortly afterwards relinquished the service, and in search of health and amusement left Calcutta for China in 1830. In this voyage, while going up the China seas, he saw for the first time the islands of the Asiatic Archipelago—islands of vast importance and unparalleled beauty—lying neglected and almost unknown. He inquired and read, and became convinced that Borneo and the Eastern Isles afforded an open field for enterprise and research. To carry to the Malay races, so long the terror of the European merchant vessel, the blessings of civilization, to suppress piracy and extirpate the slave-trade, became his humane and generous objects; and from that hour the energies of his powerful mind were devoted to this one pursuit. Often foiled, often disappointed, but animated with a perseverance and enthusiasm which defied all obstacle, he was not until 1838 enabled to set sail from England on his darling project. The intervening years had been devoted to preparation and inquiry; a year spent in the Mediterranean had tested his vessel, the 'Royalist,' and his crew; and so completely had he studied his subject, and calculated on contingencies, that the least sanguine of his friends felt as he left the shore, hazardous and unusual as the enterprise appeared to be, that he had omitted nothing to insure a successful issue. "I go," said he, "to awake the spirit of slumbering philanthropy with regard to these islands; to carry Sir Stamford Raffles' views in Java over the whole Archipelago. Fortune and life I give freely; and if I fail in the attempt, I shall not have lived wholly in vain."

"In the admiration I feel for him I may farther be permitted to add, that if any man ever possessed in himself the resources and means by which such noble designs were to be achieved, that man was James Brooke! Of the most enlarged views; truthful and generous; quick to acquire and



appreciate; excelling in every manly sport and exercise; elegant and accomplished; ever accessible; and above all, prompt and determined to redress injury and relieve misfortune,—he was of all others the best qualified to impress the native mind with the highest opinion of the English character. How he has succeeded, the influence he has acquired, and the benefits he has conferred, his own uncoloured narrative, contained in the following pages, best declares, and impresses on the world a lasting lesson of the good that attends individual enterprise, when well-directed, of which every Englishman may feel justly proud."

"Such is the sketch of Mr. Brooke by one well competent to judge of that to which he bears witness. In pursuance of the mission thus eloquently and truly described, that gentleman left his native shores in the year 1838, in his yacht the 'Royalist' schooner, of 142 tons, belonging to the Royal Yacht Squadron, with a crew of upwards of twenty men. His general views were distinct and certain; but the details into which they shaped themselves have been so entirely guided by unforeseen occurrences, that it is necessary to look to his first visit to Borneo for their explanation; and in order to do so, I must refer to his private journal, which he kindly confided to me, after I had in vain tried to persuade him to take upon himself the publication of its contents, so rich in new and interesting intelligence."—Vol. i. pp. 2, &c.

Mr. Brooke's own journal thus describes the preparation necessary for his project.

"I had for some years turned my mind to the geography of the Indian Archipelago, and cherished an ardent desire to become better acquainted with a country combining the richest natural productions with an unrivalled degree of luxuriant beauty. Circumstances for a time prevented my entering on this field for enterprise and research; and when the barriers were removed, I had many preparations to make and some difficulties to overcome.

"In an expedition conducted by government, the line of discipline is so distinctly understood, and its infringement so strictly punished, that small hazard is incurred of any inconvenience arising from such a source. With an individual, however, there is no such assurance, for he cannot appeal to the articles of war; and the ordinary legal enactments for the protection of the mariner will not enable him to effect objects so far removed beyond the scope of the laws. I was fully aware that many would go, but that few might stay; for whilst a voyage of discovery *in prospectu* possesses great attractions for the imagination, the hardship, danger, and the thousand other rude realities, soon dissipate the illusion, and leave the aspirant longing for that home he should never have quitted. In like manner, seamen can be procured in abundance, but cannot be kept from desertion whenever any matter goes wrong; and the total previous ignorance of their characters and dispositions renders this more likely, as the admission of one "black sheep" goes far to taint the entire crew.

"These considerations fully convinced me that it was necessary to form *men* to my purpose, and by a line of steady and kind conduct, to raise up a personal regard for myself and attachment for the vessel, which could not be expected in ordinary cases. In pursuance of this object, I was nearly three years in preparing a crew to my mind, and gradually moulding them to consider the hardest fate or misfortune under my command as better than the ordinary service in a merchant-vessel. How far I have succeeded, remains yet to be proved; but I cannot help hoping that I have raised the character of many, and have rendered all happy and contented since they have been with me; and certain am I that no men can do their duty more cheerfully or willingly than the crew of the 'Royalist.'



"I may pass over in silence, my motives for undertaking so long and arduous a voyage; and it will be sufficient to say, that I have been firmly convinced of its beneficial tendency in adding to knowledge, increasing trade, and spreading Christianity. The prospectus of the undertaking was published in the *Geographical Journal*, vol. viii. part iii. of 1838, when my preparations for sea were nearly complete. I had previously avoided making any public mention of my intentions, for praise before performance is disgusting; and I knew that I should be exposed to prying curiosity, desirous of knowing what I did not know myself.—Vol. i. pp. 5, &c.

On the 16th of December, 1838, the 'Royalist' finally quitted England, and on the first of June in the following year, the adventurous party reached Singapore, which port formed their head-quarters for subsequent refittings, and for communication with Europe. On the 1st of August they anchored off Borneo, but this year they remained but a few months, during which time Mr. Brooke made many interesting exploring expeditions, and formed an acquaintance with Muda Hassim, the Rajah of Sarawak, who is afterwards most prominent in the history. He then returned to Singapore, and his next voyage was devoted to the islands of the Celebes. That expedition, and also ill-health, prevented his again visiting Sarawak till the end of August 1840. From this time began the extraordinary part of his career. Instead of only exploring the country, he now became immersed in its politics. Muda Hassim enlisted him on his side against an army of rebels in the interior, and by a long course of events, in all which the virtues we have ascribed to him are most conspicuous, he at length received the appointment of Rajah of Sarawak in September 1841, Muda Hassim giving up his position—having only undertaken it during the civil war—with the intention of returning to Borneo Proper, of which his uncle was the sultan. Once in power, his influence increased most rapidly; he established courts of justice, in which he arbitrated between the oppressive Malays and their Dyak dependents in a manner that astonished the former, and made the latter look on him as their friend. He then directed his attention to the establishment of commercial intercourse between Borneo and Europe, and as a first step, he waged desperate war with the swarms of pirates that have for ages infested the whole coast. This would appear to have been the occupation of whole tribes, whose cruelties and depredations put an entire stop to all improvement in the general state of the island. For this purpose he received assistance from several of H. M. Ships, and in company with Captain Keppel of the 'Dido,' he had many a sharp encounter, before the haunts where these lawless wretches protected themselves in most formidable array could be broken up. In 1845 Mr. Brooke was appointed Her Majesty's agent in Borneo, and sailed for Borneo Proper (the chief town of the island),

where, after strengthening his position with the local authorities, a work of no little difficulty and patience, he examined the island of Labuan with a view to its becoming a British station, a design which was afterwards realized. He then went back to Sarawak, and from thence, as our readers are aware, he has returned to his native shores, not to repose in honours already won, but to increase his means of future usefulness. May he not be disappointed! may the reception he has met with at home enable him to establish his own position with honour and security, as well as the commercial interests of both countries with mutual profit! and, more than all, may the Christian mission he has been the means of sending be productive of a mighty revolution in the whole condition of the native inhabitants!

It is time now that we discuss the natural features of the island, but as the direct mention of these is brought in chiefly with reference to commerce, it is only incidentally that we come across descriptions of scenery. Mr. Brooke's journal differs materially from the journal of a mere traveller, for his thoughts were too much taken up with the business he was always engaged in, to allow him very often to enlarge on mere objects of beauty, though we have ample testimony throughout that such things were fully appreciated by him. The following passage presents an agreeable scene.

'We left our boats near its entrance, and walked to the small but steep mountain, Tubbang. Its length may be about 400 feet. After mounting by a winding path, about half-way up towards the top, we arrived at the entrance of a cave, into which we descended through a hole. It is fifty or sixty feet long, and the far end is supported on a colonnade of stalactites, and opens on a sheer precipice of 100 or 150 feet. Hence the spectator can overlook the distant scene; the forest lies at his feet, and only a few trees growing from the rock reach nearly to the level of the grotto. The effect is striking and panoramic; the grotto cheerful; floored with fine sand; the roof groined like Gothic, whence the few clear drops which filter through, form here and there the fantastic stalactites common to such localities. The natives report the cave to be the residence of a fairy queen; and they show her bed, pillow, and other of her household furniture. Within the cave we found a few remnants of human bones; probably some poor Dyak who had crawled there to die.'—Vol. i. p. 202.

The province of Sarawak, which we may take as a sample of the whole island, is thus described:—

'It is bounded to the westward by the Sambas territory, to the southward by a range of mountains which separate it from the Pontiana river, and to the eastward by the Borneon territory of Sadong. Within this space there are several rivers and islands, which it is needless here to describe at length, as the account of the river of Sarawak will answer alike for the rest. There are two navigable entrances to this river, and numerous smaller branches for boats, both to the westward and eastward; the two principal entrances combine at about twelve miles from the sea, and the river flows for twenty miles into the interior in a southerly and westerly

direction, when it again forms two branches—one running to the right, the other to the left hand, as far as the mountain range. Besides these facilities for water communication, there exist three other branches from the easternmost entrance, called Morotaba, one of which joins the Samarahan river, and the two others flow from different points of the mountain range already mentioned. The country is diversified by detached mountains, and the mountain range has an elevation of about 3,000 feet. The aspect of the country may be generally described as low and woody at the entrance of the rivers, except a few high mountains; but in the interior, undulating in parts, and part presenting fine level plains. The climate may be pronounced healthy and cool, though in the six months from September to March a great quantity of rain falls. During my three visits to this place, which have been prolonged to eight months, and since residing here, we have been clear of sickness, and during the entire period not one of three deaths could be attributed to the effects of climate. The more serious maladies of tropical climates are very infrequent; from fever and dysentery we have been quite free, and the only complaints have been rheumatism, colds, and ague; the latter, however, attacked us in the interior, and no one has yet had it at Sarawak, which is situated about twenty-five miles from the mouth of the river.

The soil and productions of this country are of the richest description; and it is not too much to say, that, within the same given space, there are not to be found the same mineral and vegetable riches in any land in the world. I propose to give a brief detail of them, beginning with the soil of the plains, which is moist and rich, and calculated for the growth of rice, for which purpose it was formerly cleared and used, until the distractions of the country commenced. From the known industry of the Dyaks, and their partiality to rice-cultivation, there can be little doubt that it would become an article of extensive export, provided security were given to the cultivator, and a proper remuneration for his produce. The lower grounds, besides rice, are well adapted for the growth of sago, and produce canes, rattans, and forest timber of the finest description for ship-building and other useful purposes. The Chinese export considerable quantities of timber from Sambas and Pontiana, particularly of the kind called Balean by the natives, or the lion wood of the Europeans; and at this place it is to be had in far greater quantity and nearer the place of sale. The undulating ground differs in soil, some portions of it being a yellowish clay, whilst the rest is a rich mould; these grounds, generally speaking, as well as the slopes of the higher mountains, are admirably calculated for the growth of nutmegs, coffee, pepper, or any of the more valuable vegetable productions of the tropics. Besides the above-mentioned articles, there are birds'-nests, bees'-wax, and several kinds of scented wood, in demand at Singapore, which are all collected by the Dyaks, and would be gathered in far greater quantity provided the Dyak was allowed to sell them.

Turning from the vegetable to the mineral riches of the country, we have diamonds, gold, tin, iron, and antimony-ore certain; I have lately sent what I believe to be a specimen of lead-ore to Calcutta; and copper is reported. It must be remembered, in reading this list, that the country is as yet unexplored by a scientific person, and that the inquiries of a geologist and a mineralogist would throw further light on the minerals of the mountains, and the spots where they are to be found in the greatest plenty. The diamonds are stated to be found in considerable numbers, and of a good water; and I judge the statement to be correct from the fact that the diamond-workers from Sandak come here and work secretly, and the people from Banjarmasin, who are likewise clever at this trade, are most desirous to be allowed to work for the precious stone. Gold of a good quality certainly is to be found in large quantities. The eagerness and perseverance of the

Chinese to establish themselves is a convincing proof of the fact; and ten years since a body of about 3000 of them had great success in procuring gold by their ordinary mode of trenching the ground.—Vol. ii. pp. 188, &c.

In the island of Labuan, and on the mainland near Borneo Proper, there is also abundance of excellent coal and ironstone, which will be greater inducements to English commerce, and English steam navigation, than even gold or diamonds. It would be no slight assistance to our communication with China to have a regular supply of coal constantly waiting half way between India and Canton. The following extract will explain this advantage.

‘It will be seen by the map, that Borneo is, of all the great islands of the western portion of the Archipelago, the nearest to China, and Labuan and its neighbourhood the nearest point of this island. The distance of Hong Kong is about 1000 miles, and that of the island of Hainan, a great place for emigration, not above 800; distances which to the Chinese junks—fast sailers before the strong and favourable winds of the monsoon—do not make voyages exceeding four or five days. The coasts of the provinces of Canton and Fokien have hitherto been the great hives from which Chinese emigration has proceeded; and even Fokien is not above 1400 miles from Labuan, a voyage of seven or eight days. Chinese trade and immigration will come together. The north-west coast of Borneo produces an unusual supply of those raw articles for which there is always a demand in the markets of China; and Labuan, it may be reckoned upon with certainty, will soon become the seat of a larger trade with China than the river of Borneo ever possessed.

‘I by no means anticipate the same amount of rapid advance in population, commerce, or financial resources for Labuan, that has distinguished Singapore, a far more central position for general commerce; still I think its prospect of success undoubted; while it will have some advantages which Singapore cannot, from its nature, possess. Its coal-mines, and the command of the coal-fields on the river of Borneo, are the most remarkable of these; and its superiority as a post-office station necessarily follows. Then it is far more convenient as a port of refuge; and, as far as our present knowledge will enable us to judge, infinitely more valuable for military purposes, more especially for affording protection to the commerce which passes through the Chinese Sea, amounting at present to probably not less than 300,000 tons of shipping, carrying cargoes certainly not under the value of 15,000,000*l.* sterling.’—Vol. ii. pp. 222, &c.

We will extract a few remarks on this subject from an appendix to our present work, entitled a ‘Sketch of Borneo,’ by J. Hunt, Esq., communicated to Sir Stamford Raffles in 1812.

‘This country is by no means so warm as one would be led to imagine by its proximity everywhere to the line: this arises from the perpetual refreshing showers and the land and sea breezes, the former being wafted over innumerable rivers. In the month of November, the thermometer at Pontiana ranges from 78° to 82°.

‘During the wet season, the rivers swell and overflow the adjacent shores, and run down with such continued rapidity, that the water may be tasted fresh at sea at the distance of six or seven miles from the mouths: these overflows fertilise the banks and the adjacent country, and render the

shores of Borneo, like the plains of Egypt, luxuriantly rich. Susceptible of the highest possible culture, particularly in wet grain, in the dry season, the coasts, from these overflowings, present to the eye the richest enamelled fields of full-grown grass for miles around. It is at this season that whole herds of wild cattle range down from the mountains in the interior to fatten on the plains; but during the wet season they ascend to their hills.

'The whole of the north, the north-west, and the centre of Borneo is extremely mountainous. The greatest portion of the ancient kingdom of Borneo Proper is extremely elevated. That of Kiney Baulu, or St. Peter's Mount, in latitude 6° north, is perhaps one of the highest mountains known. The country about Sambas, Pontiana, and Sukadana is occasionally interspersed with a few ranges of hills, otherwise the land here might be deemed low. But to the southward, and more particularly to the east, in the Straits of Macassar, it is very low. The shore in these latter places is extremely moist and swampy; but the interior is said to be dry.'—Vol. i. p. 394.

An unfortunate event accompanied the first taking possession of Labuan, which did not augur well for its healthiness; but Mr. Brooke thus accounts for it:—

'The gratification we feel in recording an event of such high promise in the history of commerce and civilisation is impaired by one unhappy circumstance. The officers and crews of the two vessels suffered severely from sickness at Labuan; and Messrs. Gordon and Airey, the commander of the *Wolf* and the master of the *Iris*, fell victims to the jungle-fever. The former dying on the island, was buried there; the latter expired a few days after his return to Singapore. The sickness that prevailed among the sailors has been ascribed to their imprudent indulgence in the wild fruits of the island, to over-exertion, and needless exposure, &c. These things may have done some hurt; but the main cause of the sickness is too obvious to be mistaken. The ceremony of hoisting the flag was performed on a large space, cleared of jungle, and levelled expressly for that purpose. It is very strange that the officers engaged in the service should not have been aware of the infallible consequences of such a proceeding. In all tropical climates, deadly miasmata continue for a long while to hang over newly-made surfaces of earth, and malignant fevers surely await the white men who are rash enough to take up their abode on such spots before they have been sufficiently exposed to wind and sun.

'There is nothing, therefore, in the unfortunate incidents that have marked our taking possession of Labuan which should warrant a belief in the insalubrity of the island. Probably there is no spot within the tropics where European life is exposed to fewer risks from natural causes. The soil of the island is light and porous; it contains few or no morasses; and its situation exposes it to the action of the prevailing winds, which sweep perpetually up and down those seas. For nine months of the year it is supplied abundantly with water; and if during the other three months this article of primary necessity be less plentiful, it is still in no worse a predicament than Singapore itself. On the north of the island there are several small runnels which would appear to be supplied by perennial sources; and it will everywhere be easy to construct tanks and reservoirs.'—Vol. ii. pp. 260, &c.

From the physical constitution of Borneo, we will now turn to its inhabitants; and on this point we have Mr. Brooke's valuable opinion on various classes of his subjects before his

prejudices were likely to be enlisted in their behalf in consequence of the position of authority he now holds over them. It is on this account, perhaps, almost ungenerous to bring his own words against his territories, which were spoken under such different circumstances—as if our object were to put him out of conceit with his newly acquired subjects. Mr. Brooke is not now a mere traveller, free to say what he likes of the natives around him, but the fatherly links of his rajahship no doubt enchain his heart with a moiety of the obverse of that principle that the king can do no wrong. However this may be, or whatever are his present feelings towards the inhabitants of Borneo, how far he identifies himself with them, and whether in the act of holding a levee in his character of Rajah of Sarawak and the independent chiefs of Borneo, as he has done at Oxford, he at all forgot that he was an Englishman, and had not always been a component part of a state in the Eastern Archipelago; yet it is most certain that his dealings with the island, and his peculiar talents for engaging the sympathies of all who come in his way, have thrown very great light on characters, and on conditions of life, about which little has hitherto been known. It would be in vain to expect that any extracts from his journal could in a reasonable space give much of the information he has gathered together, or give our readers the benefit of his reflections and sentiments. The whole compilation which Captain Keppel has published is most interesting and useful. The journal is well arranged, and the captain's own part is straightforward and well written, though strongly tinged with the spirit of his profession. It is clear that the fighting part was more to his taste than the silent conferences with Malay authorities at which he had to be present. When on shore, he does not appear so much absorbed in the interest of native politics as his companion, and he has an inclination to diverge towards the more congenial subject of the prospect Borneo holds out to the future sportsman who may roam over its hills. This, however, is but incidental, and throughout his work it is impossible not to admire his high spirit, great good-nature, and the hearty admiration he uniformly manifests towards Mr. Brooke's character and intentions, as well as the ready co-operation he at all times gave him.

The inhabitants of the island of Borneo consist of three distinct races: the aborigines, commonly called Dyaks; the Malays, who are the conquerors of these people, and hold them in oppressive subjection; and lastly, the Chinese emigrants, of whom there are vast numbers. The latter are a useful body in all laborious pursuits, but as they do not enter much into the political relations of the country, we have little to do with them.



The two former are the people with whom Mr. Brooke had to deal.

The term Dyak properly applies to but one tribe of the original inhabitants, but for convenience, sake it is used as a generic term. Concerning their origin there is great doubt; that there was in time gone by a distinct Polynesian race appears certain; it is also most probable that this race was of different origin from the Asiatic nations. Mr. Brooke in one place suggests the idea that these islands were peopled originally by a tide of emigration from east to west; but after more investigation, he is satisfied with calling them aborigines, leaving it rather to be inferred that there was not that radical difference between them and the Malays as had been supposed; but that the latter invaded these islands at a later period, and were therefore much more civilized. We will not, however, enter into such a wide discussion, but confine ourselves to the present state in which they are found. This is peculiar: they are not exactly savage, yet they are far from being civilized. In many respects they have tolerable notions of the comforts and conveniences of life, yet in others they are morally depraved to an extent which excludes them from any right to the name of civilization in any stage of growth. But their character is not without hope, as is the case with some barbarous people. Their savage practices are in a great measure attributable to the fearful anarchy, misrule and oppression under which they suffer. It is hopeless for them, subject as they are to the grossest imposition and most constant depredations—nay, even habitual slaughter—to improve their condition. Mr. Brooke's sympathies have been most nobly excited in their behalf; the protection of these unfortunate, and, naturally, mild and gentle people, has ever been the chief incentive in his arduous task. Under his kind and thoughtful management we see no reason why they should not at once rise into the state of a useful and profitable people. They are, indeed, more than usually wanting in any form of religion, and this is one cause, no doubt, why they have not maintained themselves in greater independence; but the deficiency, we hope, will soon be changed into a very different aspect of affairs through the labours of those who are now setting out on their Christian mission.

The Malays are a different race; they approach nearer to our conceptions of the Asiatic character, and in their disposition form a great contrast both with Europeans and with uncivilized nations. They differ from the former not so much as being in another stage of civilization—for in many respects they are a most highly sensitive and polite people—but as being unconscious of that idea of morals which constitutes our code of

honour and propriety. All their notions of good and evil appear to find no parallel in our conceptions of truth. This partly arises from their very blood, and partly from the religion of Mahomet. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the religion of Mahomet was a political device to satisfy the peculiar moral deficiency which has ever existed in the Asiatic character, high-bred and courteous as it is. Be this as it may, the want we speak of is most apparent in the character of the Borneo Malays. They have no conception of any restraint but absolute and immediate fear. They have no honesty, no honour, no idea of truth, and no principle by which they can keep their hands from all manner of crime if they can do it with impunity. It thus follows that those in power are extortionate and oppressive, while those in subjection, being under the constant restraint of fear, show indeed more of the virtues of their race, but only from the same principle which makes one cock in a farm-yard look of an amiable disposition, whilst he is being continually thrashed by a stronger power. Remove the bigger cock, and the mildness of the other will soon vanish. The extraordinary deceitfulness and cowardice of character we find so often mentioned in the Psalms and other parts of Scripture would appear to have the Eastern stamp vividly marked; not but that human nature is the same in all; but a certain aspect of the mind, or a certain moral deficiency, may be peculiarly prominent in distinct races of the human family. Thus, there certainly is a want of the virtue understood by the term generosity, in the Eastern character. There is a disposition to exert power according to ability, not according to right; to oppress others whenever there is the opportunity; in short, to act up to the animal instinct which is observed in our former illustration from a farm-yard. On this principle, the man who is able appropriates many wives, though conscious of the laws of nature which divide the human race about equally into male and female. Again, regal authority becomes personal despotism, and every relation of life which places one in a position physically inferior to another is made the occasion of oppression and cruelty. The whole Asiatic character is represented by the fatalist's wheel of fortune. As Heaven places one up on high and another down below, they see no reason why its decrees should be opposed; they rather make it their religion to use such exaltation with all its physical force, and flatter themselves that when they are gratifying their own evil passions they are but acting in accordance with the Divine will, which has given them the opportunity of doing so. This earth appears to such a mind as a paradise into which the tempter has not intruded; for it is a place where every impulse is supposed to be good, and

no idea of an inward struggle between good and bad is taken into account. Absolute and ferocious power is the consequence of such a system of belief, and it is also the only preservative of any human society under its influence. The relations which subsist between sin or misfortune and the human race in its present state, are not understood, and therefore their effects are either rejected with unsympathizing and cruel severity, or, if that cannot be done, are submitted to with the unprofitable resignation of the fatalist.

We now proceed to lay before our readers a series of extracts illustrative of the inhabitants of Borneo, and of Mr. Brooke's manner of dealing with them. After what we have already said, it will be unnecessary to make any but explanatory comments on them.

We begin with Mr. Brooke's first introduction to Sarāwak, and his description of Muda Hassim.

'15th.—Anchored abreast of Sarāwak at seven, and saluted the rajah with twenty-one guns, which were returned with eighteen from his residence. The rajah's own brother, Pangeran Mahammed, then saluted the vessel with seven guns, which were returned. Having breakfasted, and previously intimated our intention, we pulled ashore to visit the great man. He received us in state, seated in his hall of audience, which outside is nothing but a large shed erected on piles, but within decorated with taste. Chairs were placed on each side of the ruler, who occupied the head seat. Our party were placed on one hand; on the other sat his brother Mahammed, and Macota and some others of his principal chiefs; whilst immediately behind him his twelve younger brothers were seated.

'The dress of Muda Hassim was simple, but of rich material; and most of the principal men were well, and even superbly dressed. His countenance is plain, but intelligent and highly pleasing, and his manners perfectly elegant and easy. His reception was kind, and, I am given to understand, highly flattering. We sat, however, trammelled with the formality of state, and our conversation did not extend beyond kind inquiries and professions of friendship. We were presented with tobacco rolled up in a leaf, each about a foot long, and tea was served by attendants on their knees. A band played wild and not unmusical airs during the interview, and the crowd of attendants who surrounded us were seated in respectful silence. After a visit of half an hour, we rose and took our leave.—Vol. i. pp. 28, &c.

The following extracts are descriptive of the Dyaks:—

'September 1st.—The river Lundu is of considerable breadth, about half a mile at the mouth, and 150 or 200 yards off Tungong. Tungong stands on the left hand (going up) close to the margin of the stream, and is enclosed by a slight stockade. Within this defence there is one enormous house for the whole population, and three or four small huts. The exterior of the defence between it and the river is occupied by sheds for prahus, and at each extremity are one or two houses belonging to Malay residents.

'The common habitation, as rude as it is enormous, measures 594 feet in length, and the front room, or *street*, is the entire length of the building, and twenty-one feet broad. The back part is divided by mat-partitions into the private apartments of the various families, and of these there are

forty-five separate doors leading from the public apartment. The widowers and young unmarried men occupy the public room, as only those with wives are entitled to the advantage of separate rooms. The floor of this edifice is raised twelve feet from the ground, and the means of ascent is by the trunk of a tree with notches cut in it—a most difficult, steep, and awkward ladder. In front is a terrace fifty feet broad, running partially along the front of the building, formed, like the floors, of split bamboo. This platform, as well as the front room, besides the regular inhabitants, is the resort of pigs, dogs, birds, monkeys, and fowls, and presents a glorious scene of confusion and bustle. Here the ordinary occupations of domestic labour are carried on—padi ground, mats made, &c. &c. There were 200 men, women, and children counted in the room and in front whilst we were there in the middle of the day; and allowing for those abroad and those in their own rooms, the whole community cannot be reckoned at less than 400 souls. Overhead, about seven feet high, is a second crazy story, on which they stow their stores of food and their implements of labour and war. Along the large room are hung many cots, four feet long, formed of the hollowed trunks of trees cut in half, which answer the purpose of seats by day and beds by night. The Sibnowan Dyaks are a wild-looking but apparently quiet and inoffensive race. The apartment of their chief, by name Sejulah, is situated nearly in the centre of the building, and is larger than any other. In front of it nice mats were spread on the occasion of our visit, whilst over our heads dangled about thirty ghastly skulls, according to the custom of these people. The chief was a man of middle age, with a mild and pleasing countenance and gentle manners. He had around him several sons and relations, and one or two of the leading men of his tribe; but the rest seemed by no means to be restrained by his presence, or to show him any particular marks of respect—certainly nothing of the servile obsequiousness observed by the Malays before their prince. Their dress consists of a single strip of cloth round the loins, with the ends hanging down before and behind, and a light turban, composed of the bark of trees twined round the head, and so arranged that the front is stuck up somewhat resembling a short plume of feathers.

‘Their figures are almost universally well-made, showing great activity without great muscular development; but their stature is diminutive, as will be seen by the following measurements, taken at random amongst them, and confirmed by general observation.’—Vol. i. pp. 51, &c.

‘Like the rest of the Dyaks, the Sibnowans adorn their houses with the heads of their enemies; but with them this custom exists in a modified form; and I am led to hope, that the statements already made public of their reckless search after human beings, *merely* for the purpose of obtaining their heads, will be found to be exaggerated, if not untrue; and that the custom elsewhere, as here and at Lundu, will be found to be more accordant with our knowledge of other wild tribes, and to be regarded merely as a triumphant token of valour in the fight or ambush; similar, indeed, to the scalps of the North American Indian.

‘Some thirty skulls were hanging from the roof of the apartment; and I was informed that they had many more in their possession; all, however, the heads of enemies, chiefly of the tribe of Sarebus. On inquiring, I was told, that it is indispensably necessary a young man should procure a skull before he gets married. When I urged on them, that the custom would be more honoured in the breach than in the observance, they replied, that it was established from time immemorial, and could not be dispensed with. Subsequently, however, Sejulah allowed that heads were very difficult to obtain now, and a young man might sometimes get married by giving presents to his lady-love’s parents. At all times they warmly denied ever

obtaining any heads but those of their enemies; adding, they were bad people, and deserved to die.

'I asked a young unmarried man whether he would be obliged to get a head before he could obtain a wife. He replied, "Yes."—"When would he get one?" "Soon."—"Where would he go to get one?" "To the Sarebus river." I mention these particulars in detail, as I think, had their practice extended to taking the head of any defenceless traveller, or any Malay surprised in his dwelling or boat, I should have wormed the secret out of them.

'The men of this tribe marry but one wife, and that not until they have attained the age of seventeen or eighteen. Their wedding-ceremony is curious; and, as related, is performed by the bride and bridegroom being brought in procession along the large room, where a brace of fowls is placed over the bridegroom's neck, which he whirls seven times round his head. The fowls are then killed, and their blood sprinkled on the forehead of the pair, which done they are cooked, and eaten by the new-married couple *alone*, while the rest feast and drink during the whole night.

'Their dead are put in a coffin, and buried; but Sejugah informed me that the different tribes vary in this particular; and it would appear they differ from their near neighbours the Dyaks of Lundu.

'Like these neighbours, too, the Sibnowans seem to have little or no idea of a God. They offer prayers to Biedum, the great Dyak chief of former days. Priests and ceremonies they have none; the thickest mist of darkness is over them: but how much easier is it to dispel darkness with light, than to overcome the false blaze with the rays of truth!—Vol. i. pp. 55, &c.

'The labour of the house, and all the drudgery, falls on the females. They grind the rice, carry burdens, fetch water, fish, and work in the fields; but though on a par with other savages in this respect, they have many advantages. They are not immured; they eat in company with the males; and, in most points, hold the same position towards their husbands and children as European women. The children are entirely naked; and the only peculiarity I observed is filing their teeth to a sharp point like those of a shark. The men marry but one wife, as I have before observed. Concubinage is unknown; and cases of seduction or adultery very seldom arise. Even the Malays speak highly of the chastity of the Dyak women; yet they are by no means shy under the gaze of strangers, and used to bathe before us in a state of nudity.

'That these Dyaks are in a low condition there is no doubt; but comparatively theirs is an innocent state, and I consider them capable of being easily raised in the scale of society. The absence of all prejudice regarding diet, the simplicity of their characters, the purity of their morals, and their present ignorance of all forms of worship and all idea of future responsibility, render them open to conviction of truth and religious impression. Yet when I say this, I mean, of course, only when their minds shall have been raised by education; for without previous culture, I reckon the labours of the missionary as useless as endeavouring to read off a blank paper. I doubt not but the Sibnowan Dyaks would readily receive missionary families amongst them, provided the consent of the Rajah Muda Hassim was previously obtained. That the rajah would consent, I much doubt; but if any person chose to reside at Tungong for the charitable purpose of leading the tribe gradually, by means of education, to the threshold of Christianity, it would be worth the asking, and I would exert what influence I possess with him on the occasion. I feel sure a missionary would be safe amongst them as long as he strictly confined himself to the gentle precepts and practice of his faith; he would live abundantly and cheaply, and be exposed to no danger except from the incursion of hostile

tribes, which must always be looked for by a sojourner amid a Dyak community.'—Vol. i. pp. 59, &c.

'The musical instruments were the tomtom, or drum, and the Malayan gong; which were beat either slow or fast, according to the measure of the dance. The dances are highly interesting, more especially from their close resemblance, if not identity, with those of the South Sea Islanders. Two swords were placed on the mat, and two men commenced slowly from the opposite extremities, turning the body, extending the arms, and lifting the legs, in grotesque but not ungraceful attitudes. Approaching thus leisurely round and round about, they at length seize the swords, the music plays a brisker measure, and the dancers pass and repass each other, now cutting, now crossing swords, retiring and advancing; one kneeling as though to defend himself from the assaults of his adversary, at times stealthily waiting for an advantage, and quickly availing himself of it. The measure throughout was admirably kept, and the frequent turns were simultaneously made by both dancers, accompanied by the same eccentric gestures. The effect of all this far surpasses the impression to be made by a meagre description. The room partially lighted by damar torches—the clang of the noisy instruments—the crowd of wild spectators—their screams of encouragement to the performers—the flowing hair and rapid evolutions of the dancers, formed a scene I wish could have been reduced to painting by such a master as Rembrandt or Caravaggio.'—Vol. i. pp. 63, &c.

'The Dyaks, as is well known, are famous for the manufacture of iron. The forge here is of the simplest construction, and formed by two hollow trees, each about seven feet high, placed upright, side by side, in the ground; from the lower extremity of these, two pipes of bamboo are led through a clay-bank, three inches thick, into a charcoal-fire; a man is perched at the top of the trees, and pumps with two pistons (the suckers of which are made of cocks' feathers), which being raised and depressed alternately, blow a regular stream of air into the fire. Drawings were taken of these, and other utensils and instruments.'—Vol. i. pp. 65, &c.

We now give a few warlike scenes at which Mr. Brooke was present in assisting Muda Hassim against the rebels of the interior. We trust that, under his government, the 'grand army' of Sarāwak will be more valiant than heretofore.

'The Borneons, in fighting, wear a quilted jacket or spencer, which reaches over the hips, and from its size has a most unservicelike appearance: the bare legs and arms sticking out from under this puffed-out coat, like the sticks which support the garments of a scarecrow. Such was our incongruous and most inefficient army; yet with 300 men who would fight, nothing would have been easier than to take the detached defences of the enemy, none of which could contain above thirty or forty men. But our allies seemed to have little idea of fighting except behind a wall; and my proposal to attack the adversary was immediately treated as an extreme of rashness amounting to insanity. At a council of war it was consequently decided that advances should be made from the hill behind our fort to Balidah, by a chain of posts, the distance being a short mile, in which space they would probably erect four or five forts; and then would come a bombardment, noisy but harmless.

'During the day we were not left quiet. The beating of gongs, shouts, and an occasional shot, gave life to the scene. With my glass I could espy our forces at the top of the hill, pleased no doubt to see us coming to their support. At night loud shouts and firing from the rebels caused us to prepare for an attack; but it proved to be nothing but lights moving about



the hill-side, with what intent we were ignorant. The jungle on the left bank having been cleared, we did not much expect any skirmishers; but some spies were heard near our boats. With this exception the night passed away unbroken on our part, though the rebels kept up an incessant beating of gongs, and from time to time fired a few stray shots, whether against an enemy or not was doubtful.

'25th.—The grand army was lazy, and did not take the field when they possessed themselves of two eminences, and commenced forts on each. About eleven A.M. we got intelligence that the enemy was collecting on the right bank, as they had been heard by our scouts shouting one to another to gather together in order to attack the stockades in the course of building. Even with a knowledge of their usual want of caution, I could not believe this, but walked nevertheless to one of the forts, and had scarcely reached it when a universal rebel shout, and a simultaneous beating of the silver-tongued gongs, announced, as I thought, a general action. But though the shouts continued loud and furious from both sides, and a gun or two was discharged in air to refresh their courage, the enemy did not attack, and a heavy shower damped the ardour of the approaching armies, and reduced all to inaction. Like the heroes of old, however, the adverse parties spoke to each other: "We are coming, we are coming," exclaimed the rebels; "lay aside your muskets, and fight us with swords." "Come on," was the reply; "we are building a stockade, and want to fight you." And so the heroes ceased not to talk, but forgot to fight, except that the rebels opened a fire from Balidah from swivels, all of which went over the tops of the trees. Peace, or rather rest, being restored, our party succeeded in entrenching themselves, and thus gained a field which had been obstinately assaulted by big words and loud cries. The distance of one fort from Balidah was about 800 yards, and manned with sixty Malays; whilst a party of Chinese garrisoned the other. Evening fell upon this innocent warfare. The Borneons, in this manner, contend with vociferous shouts; and, preceding each shout, the leader of the party offers up a prayer aloud to the Almighty, the chorus (or properly response) being the acclamation of the soldiery. We, on our side, kept up a firing and hallooing till midnight, to disguise the advance of a party who were to seize and build a stockade within a shorter distance of Balidah. When they reached the spot, however, the night being dark, the troops sleepy, and the leaders of different opinions, they returned without effecting any thing.—Vol. i. pp. 156, &c.

'26th.—I must here pause in my account of this extraordinary and novel contest, briefly to describe the general appearance of the country.

'It is one delightful to look upon, combining all the requisites of the picturesque, viz., wood, water, mountain, cliff, and a foreground gently undulating, partially cultivated, and of the richest soil. The mountain of Sarambo, about 3000 feet in height, is the principal feature in the scene, situated at a short distance from the left bank of the river. The remainder of the ground slopes gradually; and the town of Siniawan, likewise on the left bank, is close to the water, and at the foot of the eminence called Gunga Kumiel.

'The advance of the party last night was, as I have said, disguised by firing, drumming, and shouting from the fleet and forts; and, in the deep stillness of the fine night, the booming of the guns, the clamour of the gongs, and the outcries raised from time to time, came on our ears like the spirit of discord breaking loose on a fair and peaceful paradise. About one o'clock the noises died away, and I enjoyed as quiet a slumber till daylight as though pillowed on a bed of down in the heart of Old England. About six I visited the three forts. The Chinese, Malays, and Dyaks were taking their morning meal, consisting of half a cocoa-nut-shell full of boiled rice

with salt. The Dyaks were served in tribes; for as many of them are at war, it is necessary to keep them separate; and though they will not fight the enemy, they would have no objection to fall out with one another, and the slightest cause might give rise to an instant renewal of hostilities.—Vol. i. pp. 160, &c.

A most favourable opportunity at length occurred for a spirited assault, but any dashing style of warfare never seems to have been consistent with their notions of discretion.

‘The enemy dared not show themselves for the fire of the grape and canister, and nothing could have been easier; but my proposition caused a commotion which it is difficult to forget, and more difficult to describe. The Chinese consented, and Macota, the commander-in-chief, was willing; but his inferiors were backward, and there arose a scene which showed me the full violence of the Malay passions, and their infuriated madness when once roused. Pangeran Houseman urged with energy the advantage of the proposal, and in the course of a speech lashed himself to a state of fury; he jumped to his feet, and with demoniac gestures stamped round and round, dancing a war-dance after the most approved fashion; his countenance grew livid, his eyes glared, his features inflamed; and, for my part, not being able to interpret the torrent of his oratory, I thought the man possessed of a devil, or about to “run a-muck.” But after a minute or two of this dance, he resumed his seat, furious and panting, but silent. In reply, Subtu urged some objections to my plan, which was warmly supported by Illudeen, who apparently hurt Subtu’s feelings; for the indolent, the placid Subtu leapt from his seat, seized his spear, and rushed to the entrance of the stockade, with his passions and his pride desperately aroused. I never saw finer action than when, with spear in hand, pointing to the enemy’s fort, he challenged any one to rush on with him. Houseman and Surradeen (the bravest of the brave) like madmen seized their swords to inflame the courage of the rest—it was a scene of fiends—but in vain; for though they appeared ready enough to quarrel and fight amongst themselves, there was no move to attack the enemy. All was confusion; the demon of discord and madness was amongst them, and I was glad to see them cool down, when the dissentients to the assault proposed making a round to-night and attacking to-morrow. In the mean time our six-pounders were ready in battery, and it is certain the assailants might walk nearly to the fort without any of the rebels daring to show themselves in opposition to our fire.

‘*Nov. 1st.*—The guns were ready to open their fiery mouths, and their masters ready to attend on them; but both had to wait till mid-day, when the chiefs of the grand army, having sufficiently slept, breakfasted, and bathed, lounged up with their straggling followers. Shortly after daylight the forts are nearly deserted of their garrisons, who go down at the time to the water more like a flock of geese than warriors. The instant the main division and head quarters of the army arrived at the battery, I renewed my proposal for an assault, which was variously received. If the Malays would go, the Chinese agreed; but the Malays had grown colder and colder. In order to encourage them, I opened a fire to show the effect of our guns; and having got a good range, every ball, as well as grape and canister, rattled against and through the wood. I then urged them again and again, but in vain; that coward Panglima Rajah displayed that dogged resolution which is invincible—an invincible resolution to do nothing; and the cold damp looks of the others at once told the amount of their bravery! A council of war was called—grave faces covered timid hearts and fainting spirits. The Chinese contended, with justice, that in fairness they could not

be expected to assault unless the Malays did the same; Abong Mia was not brave enough. The Datu agreed, and Panglima delivered himself of a wise harangue, to the effect that, "the last campaign, when they had a fort, how had the enemy fired then?—stabbed them, speared them, &c. &c.; and without a fort, assaulting!—how could it be expected they should succeed? how unreasonable they should go at all!" But even his stolid head seemed to comprehend the sarcasm when I asked him how many men had been killed during all this severe fighting? However, it was clear that it was no battle. We were all very savage, and I intimated how useless my being with them was, if they intended to play instead of fight. "What," I asked, "if you will not attack, are you going to do?" Oh, the wise counsels of these wise heads! Abong Mia proposed erecting a fort in a tree, and thence going "puff, puff," down into Balidah, accompanying the words "puff, puff," with expressive gestures of firing; but it was objected, that trees were scarce, and the enemy might cut down the tree, fort and all.—Vol. i. p. 166, &c.

A striking feature in the state of the island has been said to be the oppressive and cruel treatment of the Dyaks by the Malays. A few extracts with reference to this subject will be convincing of the truth of this charge. The first is the story of Si Tundo.

'Si Tundo fell in love with a woman belonging to an adopted son of Macota; and the passion being mutual, the lady eloped from her master, and went to her lover's house. This being discovered in a short time, he was ordered to surrender her to Macota, which he reluctantly did, on an understanding that he was to be allowed to marry her on giving a proper dowry. Either not being able to procure the money, or the terms not being kept, Si Tundo and a relation (who had left the pirate fleet and resided with him) mounted to Macota's hill, and threatened to take the woman and to burn the house. The village, however, being roused, they were unable to effect their purpose, and retired to their own residence. Here they remained for some days in a state of incessant watchfulness, and when they moved, they each carried their kempilan, and wore the krisses ready to the hand. The Rajah Muda Hassim, being well aware of the state of things, sent at this crisis to order Si Tundo and his friend to his presence; which order they obeyed forthwith, and entered the balei, or audience-hall, which was full of their enemies. According to Muda Hassim's account, he was anxious to save Si Tundo's life, and offered him another wife; but his affections being fixed on the girl of his own choice, he rejected the offer, only praying he might have the woman he loved. On entering the presence of the rajah, surrounded by foes, and dreading treachery (which most probably was intended), these unfortunate men added to their previous fault by one which, however slight in European estimation, is here of an aggravated nature,—they entered the presence with their kempilans in their hands, and their sarongs clear of the kris-handle; and instead of seating themselves cross-legged, they only squatted on their hams, ready for self-defence. From that hour their doom was resolved on: the crime of disrespect was deemed worthy of death, though their previous crime of abduction and violence might have obtained pardon. It was no easy matter, however, among an abject and timid population, to find executioners of the sentence against two brave and warlike men, well armed and watchful, and who, it was well known, would sell their lives dearly; and the subsequent proceeding is, as already observed, curiously characteristic of the people, and the deep disguise they can assume to attain their purposes.

It was intimated to Si Tundo, that if he could raise a certain sum of money, the woman should be made over to him; and to render this the more probable, the affair was taken out of Macota's hands, and placed at the decision of the Orang Kaya de Gadong, who *was friendly* to the offenders, but who received his private orders how to act. Four men were appointed to watch their opportunity, in order to seize the culprits. It is not to be imagined, however, that a native would trust or believe the friendly assurances held out to him; nor was it so in the case of Si Tundo and his companion; they attended at the Orang Kaya de Gadong's house frequently for weeks, with the same precautions, and it was found impossible to overpower them; but the deceit of their enemies was equal to the occasion, and delay brought no change of purpose. They were to die, and opportunity alone was wanting to carry the sentence into effect. Time passed over, suspicion was lulled; and as suspicion was lulled, the professions to serve them became more frequent. Poor Si Tundo brought *all* his little property to make good the price required for the woman, and his friend added his share; but it was still far short of the required amount. Hopes, however, were still held out; the Orang Kaya advanced a small sum to assist, and other *pretended* friends slowly and reluctantly, at his request, lent a little money. The negotiation was nearly complete; forty or fifty reals only were wanting, and the opposite party were ready to deliver the lady whenever the sum was made good. A final conference was appointed for the conclusion of the bargain at the Orang Kaya's, at which numbers were present; and the devoted victims, lulled into fatal security, had ceased to bring their formidable kempilans. At the last interview the forty reals being still deficient, the Orang Kaya proposed receiving their gold-mounted krisses in pledge for the amount. The krisses were given up, and the bargain was complete; when the four executioners threw themselves on the unarmed men, and, assisted by others, overpowered and secured them. Si Tundo, wounded in the scuffle, and bound, surrounded by enemies flourishing their krisses, remarked, "You have taken me by treachery; openly you could not have seized me." He spoke no more. They triumphed over and insulted him, as though some great feat had been achieved; and every kris was plunged into his body, which was afterwards cast, without burial, into the river. Si Tundo's relation was spared on pleading for mercy; and after his whole property, even to his clothes, was confiscated, he was allowed to retire to Sadung. Thus perished poor Si Tundo, a Magindano pirate, with many, if not all, the vices of the native character; but with boldness, courage, and constancy, which retrieved his faults, and raised him in the estimation of brave men. In person he was tall, elegantly made, with small and handsome features, and quiet and graceful manners; but towards the Malays even of rank, there was in his bearing a suppressed contempt which they often felt, but could not well resent. Alas, my gallant comrade! I mourn your death, and could have better spared a better man; for as long as you lived, I had one faithful follower of tried courage, amongst the natives. Peace be with you in the world to come; and may the Great God pardon your sins and judge you mercifully.'—Vol. i. pp. 202, &c.

The following is an account of a robbery committed by Macota's followers:—

'They beat the old man, threw him into the water, and robbed him of a tael of gold. The beating and attempt at drowning were certain; for the Chinese hadji was so ill for several days under my care, that he was in considerable danger. He complained to me loudly of Macota; and from other sources I gained a pretty accurate account of that gentleman's proceedings. By threats,

by intrigue, by falsehood, and even by violence, he had prevented or driven all persons from daring to visit or come near me whether abroad or ashore. He was taxing the poor Dyaks, harassing the Siniawans, and leagued with the Borneo pangerans to plunder and get all he possibly could. Every Dyak community was watched by his followers, and a spear raised opposite the chief's house, to intimate that no person was to trade or barter except the pangeran. The mode of plunder is thus perpetrated. Rice, clothes, gongs, and other articles are sent to a tribe at a fixed price, which the Dyaks dare not refuse, for it is at the risk of losing their children! The prices thus demanded by Macota were as follows: one gantong of rice for thirty birds'-nests. Twenty-four gantongs here is equal to a pecul of rice—a pecul of rice costs one dollar and a half, whereas thirty birds'-nests weigh one catty, and are valued at two rupees; so that the twenty-fourth part of one and a half dollars is sold for two rupees! Was it surprising that these people were poor and wretched? My astonishment was, that they continued to labour, and indeed nothing but their being a surprisingly industrious race can account for it; and they are only enabled to live at all by secreting a portion of their food. Yet war and bad government, or rather no government, have had the effect of driving more than half the Dyak tribes beyond the limits of Sarāwak.

'The rapacity of these Malays is as unbounded as it is short-sighted; for one would think that the slightest degree of common sense would induce some of the chiefs to allow no one to plunder except themselves. But this is so far from being the case, that when their demand has been enforced, dozens of inferior wretches extort and plunder in turn, each according to his ability; and though the Dyak is not wanting in obstinacy, he can seldom withstand these robberies; for each levy is made in the name of the rajah, or some principal pangeran; and the threat of bringing the powerful tribe of Sakarrans or Sarebus to deprive them of their heads, and wives and families, generally reduces them to obedience. Whilst on this subject, I may as well mention a fact that came later to my knowledge, when several of the Dyak chiefs, and one of particular intelligence, Si Meta by name, assured me that each family paid direct revenue from thirty to fifty pasus (tubs) of padi, besides all the other produces, which are extorted at merely nominal prices.'—Vol. i. pp. 245, &c.

Another most shameful mode of exaction and tyranny is also practised.

'It consists in lending small sums of money to the natives (that is, Sarāwak people), and demanding interest at the rate of fifty per cent. per month; by this means a small sum is quickly converted into one which is quite out of the power of the poor man to pay; and he, his wife, and children, are taken to the house of the creditor to work for him, whilst the debt still accumulates, and the labour is endless. I intend to strike at this slavery in disguise, but not just yet; the suppression of robbery, the criminal department of justice, being more immediately important.'—Vol. i. pp. 279, &c.

'The government of the Dyaks I have already detailed; and though we might hope that in a more settled state of things they would have been more secure from foreign pillage, yet they were annually deprived of the proceeds of their labour, debarred from trade, and deprived of every motive to encourage industry. The character of their rulers for humanity alone fixed the measure of their suffering, and bad was the best; but it seems to be a maxim amongst all classes of Malays, that force alone can keep the Dyaks in proper subjection; which is so far true, that force alone, and the hopelessness of resistance, could induce a wild people to part with the

food on which they depend for subsistence. At a distance I have heard of and pitied the sufferings of the negroes and the races of New Holland—yet it was the cold feeling dictated by reason and humanity; but now, having witnessed the miseries of a race superior to either, the feeling glows with the fervour of personal commiseration: so true is it that visible misery will raise us to exertion, which the picture, however powerfully delineated, can never produce. The thousands daily knelled out of the world, who lie in gorgeous sepulchres, or rot unburied on the surface of the earth, excite no emotion compared to that conjured up by the meanest dead at our feet. We read of tens of thousands killed and wounded in battle, and the glory of their deeds, or the sense of their defeat, attracts our sympathy; but if a single mangled warrior, ghastly with wounds and writhing with pain, solicited our aid, we should deplore his fate with tenfold emotion, and curse the strife which led to such a result. Among the thousands starving for want of food we trouble not ourselves to seek one; but if the object is presented before our eyes, how certain a compassion is aroused! To assist is a duty; but in the performance of this duty, to be gentle and feeling is godlike, and probably, between individuals, there is no greater distinction than in this tender sympathy towards distress. Poor, poor Dyaks! exposed to starvation, slavery, death! you may well raise the warmest feelings of compassion—enthusiasm awakes at witnessing your sufferings! To save men from death has its merit; but to alleviate suffering, to ameliorate all the ills of slavery, to protect these tribes from pillage and yearly scarcity, is far nobler; and if, in the endeavour to do so, one poor life is sacrificed, how little is it in the vast amount of human existence!—Vol. i. pp. 270, &c.

Mr. Brooke is anxious, in the later portions of his journal, to give as favourable an idea as possible of the Malay character; and he states his opinion, that the prejudice against them is founded more on the character of the rajahs and their dependants than on the mass. We strongly suspect, however, that whoever was rajah (of course excepting the present Rajah of Sarāwak) the result would be the same.

'28th.—How is it to be accounted for that the Malays have so bad a character with the public, and yet that the few who have had opportunities of knowing them well speak of them as a simple and not unamiable people? With the vulgar, the idea of a Malay—and by the Malay they mean the entire Polynesian race, with the exception of the Javanese—is that of a treacherous, bloodthirsty villain; and I believe the reason to be, that from our first intercourse to the present time, it is the pangerans or rajahs of the country, with their followers, who are made the standard of Malay character. These rajahs, born in the purple, bred amid slaves and fighting-cocks, inheriting an undisputed power over their subjects, and under all circumstances, whether of riches or poverty, receiving the abject submission of those around their persons, are naturally the slaves of their passions—haughty, rapacious, vindictive, weak, and tenacious unto death of the paltry punctilio of their court. The followers of such rajahs it is needless to describe;—they are the tools of the rajah's will, and more readily disposed for evil than for good; unscrupulous, cunning, intriguing, they are prepared for any act of violence. We must next contrast these with a burly, independent trader, eager after gain, probably not over-scrupulous about the means of obtaining it, ignorant of native character, and heedless of native customs and native etiquette. The result of such a



combination of ingredients causes an explosion on the slightest occasion. The European is loud, contemptuous, and abusive; the Malay cool and vindictive. The regal dignity has been insulted; the rajah has received "shame" before his court; evil counsellors are at hand to whisper the facility of revenge, and the advantages to be derived from it. The consequence too frequently follows—the captain and crew are krissed, and their vessel seized and appropriated. The repeated tragedy shocks the European mind; and the Malay has received, and continues to this day to receive, a character for treachery and bloodthirstiness. Even in these common cases an allowance must be made for the insults received, which doubtless on numerous occasions were very gross, and such flagrant violations of native customs as to merit death in native eyes; and we must bear in mind, that we never hear but one side of the tale, or only judge upon a bloody fact. It is from such samples of Malays that the general character is given by those who have only the limited means of trade for forming a judgment; but those who have known the people of the interior and lived amongst them, far removed from the influence of their rajahs, have given them a very different character. Simple in their habits, they are neither treacherous nor bloodthirsty; cheerful, polite, hospitable, gentle in their manners, they live in communities with fewer crimes and fewer punishments than most other people of the globe. They are passionately fond of their children, and indulgent even to a fault; and the ties of family relationship and good feeling continue in force for several generations. The feeling of the Malay, fostered by education, is acute, and his passions are roused if shame be put upon him; indeed, this dread of shame amounts to a disease; and the evil is, that it has taken a wrong direction, being more the dread of exposure or abuse, than shame or contrition for any offence.

'I have always found them good-tempered and obliging, wonderfully amenable to authority, and quite as sensible of benefits conferred, and as grateful, as other people of more favoured countries. Of course there is a reverse to this picture. The worst feature of the Malay character is the want of all candour or openness, and the restless spirit of cunning intrigue which animates them, from the highest to the lowest. Like other Asiatics, truth is a rare quality amongst them. They are superstitious, somewhat inclined to deceit in the ordinary concerns of life, and they have neither principle nor conscience when they have the means of oppressing an infidel, and a Dyak who is their inferior in civilization and intellect.

'If this character of the Malay be summed up, it will be anything but a bad one on the whole; it will present a striking contrast to the conduct and character of the rajahs and their followers, and I think will convince any impartial inquirer, that it is easily susceptible of improvement. One of the most fertile sources of confusion is, classing at one time all the various nations of the Archipelago under the general name of Malay, and at another restricting the same term to one people, not more ancient, not the fountain-head of the others, who issued from the centre of Sumatra, and spread themselves in a few parts of the Archipelago.'—Vol. ii. pp. 129, &c.

No small portion of our work is devoted to the subject of the pirates who infest every river, and bring terror to every quiet inhabitant of the island. These are composed chiefly of certain tribes of Dyaks, deriving their name from the river where they emerge on their pestilential errands. They differ very much in their equipments, and in the field of their exertions. Some keep close to shore, and commit depredations on the small craft

of the coast, or on the villages adjoining; others, better armed, venture out far to sea, and attack ships laden with merchandise; while some are strangely in league with the Malay authorities, who, in the tender care they exercise over those their subjects, will sometimes admit these pirates up the rivers, on the condition of sharing the spoil. As this part of the population will, however, soon meet with a serious check to their operations, if they have not done so already, from the severe lessons which have been taught some of their number, we hope that they will remain only in history; and as we are not inclined to invest their memory with any cloak of romance, as is often the case with celebrated robbers, we will content ourselves with giving an extract or two descriptive of their signal discomfiture at the hands of Captain Keppel and the gallant crew of the 'Dido.'

'June 11th.—We moved on immediately after the passing up of the bore, the dangers of which appeared to have been greatly exaggerated. The beating of gongs and discharge of cannon had been going on the whole of the previous night.

'The scenery improved in beauty every yard that we advanced; but our attention was drawn from it by the increase of yelling as we approached the scene of action. Although as yet we had only heard our enemies, our rapid advance with a strong tide must have been seen by them from the jungle on the various hills which now rose to our view.

'Being in my gig, somewhat ahead of the boats, I had the advantage of observing all that occurred. The scene was the most exciting I ever experienced. We had no time for delay or consideration: the tide was sweeping us rapidly up; and had we been inclined to retreat then, we should have found it difficult. A sudden turn in the river brought us (Mr. Brooke was by my side) in front of a steep hill which rose from the bank. It had been cleared of jungle, and long grass grew in its place. As we hove in sight, several hundred savages rose up, and gave one of their war-yells: it was the first I had heard. No report from musketry or ordnance could ever make a man's heart feel so *small* as mine did at that horrid yell: but I had no leisure to think. I had only time for a shot at them with my double-barrel as they rushed down the steep, whilst I was carried past. I soon after heard the report of our large boat's heavy gun, which must have convinced them that we likewise were prepared.

'On the roof of a long building, on the summit of the hill, were several warriors performing a war-dance, which it would be difficult to imitate on such a stage. As these were not the forts we were in search of, we did not delay longer than to exchange a few shots in sweeping along.

'Our next obstacle was more troublesome, being a strong barrier right across the river, formed of two rows of trees placed firmly in the mud, with their tops crossed and secured together by rattans; and along the fork, formed by the crossing of the tops of these stakes, were other trees firmly secured. Rapidly approaching this barrier, I observed a small opening that might probably admit of a canoe; and gathering good way, and putting my gig's head straight at it, I squeezed through. On passing it the scene again changed, and I had before me three formidable-looking forts, which lost not a moment in opening a discharge of cannon on my unfortunate gig. Luckily their guns were properly elevated for the range of the barrier; and, with the exception of a few straggling grape-shot that splashed the water round us, the whole went over our heads. For a

moment I found myself cut off from my companions, and drifting fast upon the enemy. The banks of the river were covered with warriors, yelling and rushing down to possess themselves of my boat and its crew. I had some difficulty in getting my long gig round, and paddling up against the stream; but while my friend Brooke steered the boat, my coxswain and myself kept up a fire, with tolerable aim, on the embrasures, to prevent, if possible, their reloading before the pinnace, our leading boat, could bring her twelve-pound carronade to bear. I was too late to prevent the pinnace falling athwart the barrier, in which position she had three men wounded. With the assistance of some of our native followers, the rattan-lashings which secured the heads of the stakes were soon cut through; and I was not sorry when I found the 'Dido's' first cutter on the same side with myself. The other boats soon followed; and while the pinnace kept up a destructive fire on the fort, Mr. D'Aeth, who was the first to land, jumped on shore, with his crew, at the foot of the hill on the top of which the nearest fort stood, and at once rushed for the summit. This mode of warfare—this dashing at once in the very face of their fort—was so novel and incomprehensible to our enemies, that they fled, panic-struck, into the jungle; and it was with the greatest difficulty that our leading men could get even a snap-shot at the rascals as they went.—Vol. ii. pp. 48, &c.

'To the left of our position, and about 200 yards up the river, large trees were being felled during the night; and by the torch-lights showing the spot, the officer of the boat, Mr. Partridge, kept up a very fair ball-practice with the pinnace's gun. Towards morning a shot fell apparently just where they were at work; and that being accompanied by what we afterwards ascertained caused more horror and consternation among the enemy than any thing else, a common signal sky-rocket, made them resign the ground entirely to us. The last shot, too, that was fired from the pinnace had killed three men.'—Vol. ii. p. 58.

A truce being at length declared, Mr. Brooke made the best use of the influence which their victory had given him.

'He fully explained that our invasion of their country, and destruction of their forts and town, was not for the purpose of pillage or gain to ourselves, but as a punishment for their repeated and aggravated acts of piracy; that they had been fully warned, for two years before, that the British nation would no longer allow the native trade between the adjacent islands and Singapore to be cut off and plundered, and the crews of the vessels cruelly put to death, as they had been.

'They were very humble and submissive; admitted that their lives were forfeited; and if we said they were to die, they were prepared, although, they explained, they were equally willing to live. They promised to refrain for ever from piracy, and offered hostages for their good behaviour.

'Mr. Brooke then explained how much more advantageous trade would be than piracy, and invited them to a further conference at Sarawak, where they might witness all the blessings resulting from the line of conduct he had advised them to follow. If, on the other hand, we heard of a single act of piracy being committed by them, their country should be again invaded and occupied; and their enemies, the whole tribe of Linga Dyaks, let loose upon them, until they were rooted out and utterly destroyed.'—Vol. ii. pp. 60, &c.

The following attack on Patusen is of the same character:—

'We now collected our boats, and made our arrangements as well as we could, for attacking a place we had not yet seen. We had now a little more difficulty in keeping our native force back, as many of those who had

accompanied the expedition last year had gained so much confidence that the desire of plunder exceeded the feeling of fear.

'After weighing at eleven, with a strong tide sweeping us up, we were not many minutes in coming in sight of the fortifications of Patusen; and indeed they were not to be despised. There were five of them, two not quite finished. Getting suddenly into six-feet water, we anchored the steamer; not so formidable a berth, although well within musket-range, as we might have taken up had I been aware of the increasing depth of water nearer the town; but we approached so rapidly there was no time to wait the interpretation of the pilot's information.

'The *'Dido'* and *'Phlegethon's'* boats were not long in forming alongside. They were directed to pull in shore, and then attack the forts in succession; but my gallant first-lieutenant, Wade, who had the command, was the first to break the line, and pull directly in the face of the largest fort. His example was followed by the others; and dividing, each boat pulled for that which appeared to the officer in command to be the one most likely to make a good fight. The forts were the first to open fire on both steamer and boats, which was quickly and smartly returned. It is impossible to imagine a prettier sight than it was from the top of the *'Phlegethon's'* paddle-box. It was my intention to have fired on the enemy from the steamer, so as to draw their attention off the boats; but owing to the defective state of the detonating priming-tubes, the guns from the vessel did not go off, and the boats had all the glory to themselves.

'They never once checked in their advance; but the moment they touched the shore the crews rushed up, entering the forts at the embrasures, while the pirates fled by the rear.

'In this sharp and short affair we had but one man killed, poor John Ellis, a fine young man, and captain of the main-top in the *'Dido.'* He was cut in two by a cannon-shot while in the act of ramming home a cartridge in the bow-gun of the *'Jolly Bachelor.'* Standing close to poor Ellis at the fatal moment was a fine promising young midddy, Charles Johnson, a nephew of Mr. Brooke's, who fortunately escaped unhurt. This, and two others badly wounded, were the only accidents on our side.

'Our native allies were not long in following our men on shore. The killed and wounded on the part of the pirates must have been considerable. Our followers got several heads. There were no fewer than sixty-four brass guns of different sizes, besides many iron, found in and about the forts: the latter we spiked and threw into the river. The town was very extensive; and after being well looted, made a glorious blaze.'—Vol. ii. pp. 88, &c.

### Considerable peril was incurred in these expeditions.

'As yet the banks of the river had been a continued garden, with sugar-cane plantations and banana-trees in abundance. As we advanced, the scenery assumed a wilder and still more beautiful appearance, presenting high steep points, with large overhanging trees, and occasionally forming into pretty picturesque bays, with sloping banks. At other times we approached narrow gorges, looking so dark that, until past, you almost doubted there being a passage through. We were in hopes that this morning we should have reached their capital, a place called Karangan, supposed to be about ten miles further on. At nine o'clock Mr. Brooke, who was with me in the gig, stopped to breakfast with young Jenkins in the second cutter. Not expecting to meet with any opposition for some miles, I gave permission to Patingi Ali to advance cautiously with his light division, and with positive instructions to fall back upon the first appearance of any natives. As the stream was running down very strong, we held on to the

bank, waiting for the arrival of the second cutter. Our pinnace and second gig having both passed up, we had remained about a quarter of an hour, when the report of a few musket-shots told us that the pirates had been fallen in with. We immediately pushed on; and as we advanced, the increased firing from our boats, and the war-yells of some thousand Dyaks, let us know that an engagement had really commenced. It would be difficult to describe the scene as I found it. About twenty boats were jammed together, forming one confused mass; some bottom up; the bows or sterns of others only visible; mixed up, pell-mell, with huge rafts; and amongst which were nearly all our advanced little division. Headless trunks, as well as heads without bodies, were lying about in all directions; parties were engaged hand to hand, spearing and krissing each other; others were striving to swim for their lives; entangled in the common *mêlée* were our advanced boats; while on both banks thousands of Dyaks were rushing down to join in the slaughter, hurling their spears and stones on the boats below. For a moment I was at a loss what steps to take for rescuing our people from the embarrassed position in which they were, as the whole mass (through which there was no passage) were floating down the stream, and the addition of fresh boats arriving only increased the confusion. Fortunately, at this critical moment one of the rafts, catching the stump of a tree, broke this floating bridge, making a passage, through which (my gig being propelled by paddles instead of oars) I was enabled to pass.

It occurred to Mr. Brooke and myself simultaneously, that, by advancing in the gig, we should draw the attention of the pirates towards us, so as to give time for the other boats to clear themselves. This had the desired effect. The whole force on shore turned, as if to secure what they rashly conceived to be their prize.

We now advanced mid-channel: spears and stones assailed us from both banks. My friend Brooke's gun would not go off; so giving him the yoke-lines, he steered the boat, while I kept up a rapid fire. Mr. Allen, in the second gig, quickly coming up, opened upon them, from a congreve-rocket tube, such a destructive fire as caused them to retire panic-struck behind the temporary barriers where they had concealed themselves previous to the attack upon Patingi Ali, and from whence they continued, for some twenty minutes, to hurl their spears and other missiles.—Vol. ii. pp. 110, &c.

### One more extract under this head will suffice.

“The pirates on the coast of Borneo may be classed into those who make long voyages in large heavy-armed prahus, such as the Illanuns, Balagnini, &c.; and the lighter Dyak fleets, which make short but destructive excursions in swift prahus, and seek to surprise rather than openly to attack their prey. A third, and probably the worst class, are usually half-bred Arab Seriffs, who possessing themselves of the territory of some Malay state, form a nucleus for piracy, a rendezvous and market for all the roving fleets; and although occasionally sending out their own followers, they more frequently seek profit by making advances, in food, arms, and gunpowder, to all who will agree to repay them at an exorbitant rate in slaves.

“The Dyaks of Sarebus and Sakarran were under the influence of two Arab Seriffs, who employed them on piratical excursions, and shared in equal parts of the plunder obtained. I had once the opportunity of counting ninety-eight boats about to start on a cruise; and reckoning the crew of each boat at the moderate average of twenty-five men, it gives a body of 2,450 men on a piratical excursion. The piracies of these Arab Seriffs

and their Dyaks were so notorious, that it is needless to detail them here ; but one curious feature, which throws a light on the state of society, I cannot forbear mentioning. On all occasions of a Dyak fleet being about to make a piratical excursion, a gong was beat round the town ordering a particular number of Malays to embark ; and in case any one failed to obey, he was fined the sum of thirty rupees by the seriff of the place.

"The blow struck by Captain Keppel, of her Majesty's ship 'Dido,' on these two communities was so decisive as to have put an entire end to their piracies ; the leaders, Seriff Sahib and Seriff Muller, had fled ; the Malay population has been dispersed ; and the Dyaks so far humbled as to sue for protection ; and in future, by substituting local Malay rulers of good character in lieu of the piratical Seriffs, a check will be placed on the Dyaks, and they may be broken of their piratical habits, in as far as interferes with the trade of the coast."—Vol. ii. pp. 144, &c.

But it is time that we should now sum up with a glance towards the future. We have followed Mr. Brooke from the commencement of his expedition to his return home, and we have seen the character he gives of the inhabitants of the island, and his accuracy is amply borne witness to by the influence he succeeded in gaining over them. Let us now consider what his position will be on his return. He came to England to complete his proposed arrangements, to be invested with authority, and to take back helping hands. He has presented his country with the fruits of his individual labours, and henceforth will, therefore, act more directly as an emissary from the British nation ; most essential, then, is it that his powers and his position should be proportioned to the anticipated advantage of his exertions. In secular affairs our government has not been neglectful. Mr. Brooke will return with his own Rajahship of Sarawak, and of the independent Chiefs of Borneo, acknowledged by the home government ; he is also gazetted as Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the island of Labuan and its dependencies. The following announcement also gives us good assurance that physical force will not be wanting to carry out his wishes. We take it from *The Times*, and its purport must be most pleasing to Mr. Brooke.

'In addition to other marks of appreciation which will be conferred by Her Majesty upon the enterprising Englishman who has done so much for the interests of his country during his residence in Borneo, the 'Meander,' of forty-four guns, commissioned at Chatham on Monday last by Lieutenant Reed, late of the 'Asia,' and to be commanded by the Hon. Henry Keppel, late of the 'Dido,' eighteen guns, recently returned from service in the Chinese seas, will convey his Excellency, Governor James Brooke, to Borneo, the scene of his former labours, in the early part of next year, and remain at that station to assist him in protecting the interests of Great Britain in that quarter of the world. Several of the parties who served in the 'Dido' have applied to the Admiralty for permission to serve in the 'Meander,' under their former gallant commander ; and it is expected she will be ready for sea and leave this country for Borneo early in February next.'



Mr. Brooke, however, would not confine himself to secular means or secular ends; he wishes to do his duty generally towards the people he is brought in contact with, and is aware that that duty consists in giving them the opportunity of hearing the truths of the Gospel, as well as of entering into commercial relations with other lands. An appeal is thus made to the English Church, and sad would it be if it were not properly responded to. No further comment is necessary from us on the subject; we will simply reprint the following paper which has been circulated relative to it, and are happy to add that a considerable sum has been collected.

‘Oxford, Nov. 25, 1847.

‘As some expression of the feeling with which the visit of James Brooke, Esq., Rajah of Sarāwak, to the University of Oxford, has been received by its members, it is proposed to raise a fund by contributions, however small, in furtherance of that object without which a Christian mission cannot be effectually or permanently established, the creation of an Episcopate in Borneo.’

‘Dec. 3, 1847.

‘It is proposed, that the sum collected (with strict reservation for the purpose of the donors) should be placed in the hands of the Borneo Mission Committee in London.’

---

- ART. III.—1. *The Constitution of the Church of the Future. A practical explanation of the correspondence with the Right Hon. W. Gladstone, on the German Church, Episcopacy and Jerusalem, &c.* By CHRISTIAN CHARLES JOSIAS BUNSEN, D.PH. D.C.L. London: Longman & Co.
2. *Fragment on the Church.* 2d Edition. *With Appendices on the same subject.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. Late Headmaster of Rugby School. London: Fellowes.
3. *Principles of Church Reform.* By the same. London: Fellowes.

It is by no means a capricious or accidental combination which leads us to unite for connected consideration the three publications, the titles of which we have prefixed to this article. On the contrary, although the different date of their publication, and the different circumstances under which they were composed might seem to disconnect them in some degree from one another, yet they are as essentially parts of one and the same whole, as if they merely formed separate chapters of the same book, or consecutive discussions, by the same author, of different portions of the same subject.

They contain a theory of the Church of Christ, and its proposed application. Mr. Bunsen's book, consisting of two parts, states in the former part the theory, (rather, it is true, in a Germanized form in point of method and expression,) and in the latter its proposed application to the condition of his own country. Dr. Arnold's fragment exhibits, in a more English manner, the identical theory, whilst his pamphlet, published a good many years since, and under widely different circumstances from those in which the Church is now placed, offers suggestions as to its practical application to the reform of the Church in England.

We need not say how much respect is due to the two writers: the one, by all confession, one of the most learned men of the age, the worthy successor of Niebuhr, the hospitable entertainer of every English scholar who visited Rome during the time of his residence in that city, the confidential minister and friend of the most earnest, according to his views, of European sovereigns;—the other, the most true, simple, conscientious of mankind; one who has impressed upon hundreds of pupils by his instruction and example, and upon hundreds of those who never saw his face, by his published correspond-

ence, the most vivid conception of energy, earnestness, goodness, and sincerity.

Nor need we say how closely and exactly these two writers sympathize in view and feelings. Dr. Arnold, to select one passage out of many, speaks thus in his correspondence (vol. ii. p. 265,) of the Chevalier Bunsen, 'I scarcely know one amongst my dearest friends, except Bunsen, whom I do not believe to be in some point or other in gross error.'

M. Bunsen speaks not less strongly in the following words:—

'It is a token full of comfort, that in our own age no one has conceived and presented the truth of the universal priesthood of Christians with so much life, and in such close connexion with the very marrow of Christian doctrine, and has made it tell once more so powerfully, convincingly, and extensively against the assumptions of the clergy church, as another clergyman of the Episcopal Church of England—Arnold. That truth was the centre point from which he started in all his thoughts and researches, and the deep and immovable foundation of his spiritual convictions with regard to the Church. The spirit of this revered apostle of the free Church of the Future, departed before he had completed the great work of his life, his book on the Church. He has been taken from amongst us before the stern combat has begun in earnest on either side. But he has left to his own people, whose love and veneration is his worthiest monument, and to us all, a living and life-inspiring testimony, not only in his writings, but in his whole life,—the model of an enlightened, faithful, and disinterested inquirer after Christian truth, and of a spirit of love and humility, not less than of freedom and power.'—*Church of the Future*, p. 221.

We have quoted these passages in order to show merely the sympathy and close agreement of these two writers in views and feelings. Let us add to them others, which express the opinion they entertain of the present crisis in the history of the Church, their judgment of past times, and their expectation of the immediate future.

'Liberty of conscience,' says Mr. Bunsen, describing the present religious state of Christendom, 'has been won, and civil liberty secured. Freedom without religion will no longer satisfy the Romanic nations, nor religion without freedom the Germanic. Among the leading nations of Europe, science has been invested with its proper privileges, either by the free consent of the rulers and clergy, or as the necessary consequence of civil liberty. Freedom of conscience has come to be considered as implied in the very idea of liberty, even in countries where as yet but little sense of personal moral responsibility is awakened: private judgment in spiritual matters,' (that is, the application to them of reason and conscience,) recognised on the one side as a right, and on the other declared to be a duty, is exercised by many, is demanded by all . . . The harmonious interchange of power between heaven and earth is restored: the charm between the visible and invisible is spanned: the barrier between the secular and the spiritual is broken down . . . Thus the world has entered upon one of those great critical epochs, when nations either unfold new powers of life, or perish. We believe they will do the former. Now or never is the time for governments and nations to come to a clear understanding with respect to Christianity, the import of the Church and her constitution.'—*Bunsen*, p. 28.

The Church, at the Reformation, 'first began to appear in the world in that full reality of which its former existence was but a shadow.' P. 67.

'He (Luther) saw clearly the impossibility of making the husk of the perishing part contain the fruit of the new life just commencing.' P. 26.

'It is undeniable that the old forms are perishing, and that men, consciously or unconsciously, are striving on all sides to arrive at a new and more perfect organization of the Church.' P. 48.

'We, for our part, betake ourselves in faith to the open sea of the freedom of the spirit.' P. 59.

'We must get rid of the narrowness and confused terminology of the Clergy-Churches, and endeavour, in faith and love, to draw forth our proposed restoration, according to the true idea of the Church, from the inmost heart of the present, not to construct it out of the dead bones of the past.' P. 84.

Dr. Arnold's language is not materially different from this:—

'So when the husk cracks, and would fain fall to pieces by the natural swelling of the seed within, a foolish zeal labours to hold it together: they who would deliver the seed are taxed with longing to destroy it; they who are smothering it, pretend that they are treading in the good old ways, and that the husk was, is, and ever will be essential. And this happens because men regard the form and not the substance; because they think that to echo the language of their forefathers, is to be the faithful imitators of their spirit; because they are blind to all the lessons which nature teaches them, and would for ever keep the eggshell unbroken, and the sheath of the leaf unburst, not seeing that the wisdom of winter is the folly of spring.'—*Fragm. of the Church*, p. 121.

We think, that if any person carefully considers these passages which we have quoted, he will agree that it is not unimportant to remark the very peculiar and strong expressions in which these two writers describe each other. It is the deliberate meaning of both, that we have reached a time in which the past constitution of the Church is as a husk, about to break with a seed full of new life, or as an egg about to open and develope a new and hitherto unseen being. Each proposes a complete restoration, or reformation, and one which will set at nought, as corrupt and useless, all that the Church has held and thought on the subject for eighteen hundred years. Each regards the other as the one man who has adequately conceived and duly represented the true idea of that which is to succeed to the obsolete and decayed Church of the past. It is really not venturing, then, at all beyond the exact and literal truth to represent them both, as being, each in the other's judgment, what Mr. Bunsen calls his lamented friend, 'the Apostles of the Church of the Future.'

*The Apostles of the Church of the Future!* It is a startling sound; one, which may well startle those who thought they already lived, and were happy and peaceful in thinking so, in a Church of the past, the present, and the future, 'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone.'

Let us then, in all seriousness, set ourselves to examine the grounds of this startling, and wonderful title: which, though it may not have been assumed with the lofty meaning which we have assigned to it, does really not exceed the vocation with which these two writers appear to regard themselves as designated to open the husk of the hitherto imperfect and undeveloped Church, and usher into destined life its new and more perfect organization. Let us ask for the signs, the tokens, the proofs from God. If these be not forthcoming, let us demand what are the arguments which are exhibited, in order to induce us to believe that the Church of God, corrupted in the first age, went on deepening its guilt and evil till the sixteenth century after Christ; that then it began to appear in the world in that full reality of which its former existence was but a shadow; that a dead and dreary period has elapsed since, during which all Church politics rest either on the remains of the earlier period, or on the mere negation of it; that now both of those things, the 'ruins of the old Clergy-Church, as well as those modern 'systems which are built up upon the mere denial of what was 'false in it,' must be swept away, in order to make room for the living restoration of the Church?

The answer is simple. These two writers claim to have found out, from the Scriptures, that the Episcopal Constitution of the Church Universal as held for sixteen hundred years was not only a corruption of the original divine institution, but a corruption so gross that it is heresy<sup>1</sup> to esteem it necessary to Church membership on the part of individuals; a corruption so early and universal, that 'the germs of the mischief may be here and there discernible'<sup>2</sup> in the first Christian writers,—that this 'false 'and superstitious notion of a Church—the very mystery of 'iniquity—began in the first century, and had no more to do 'with Rome in the outset, than with Alexandria, Antioch, or 'Carthage;'<sup>3</sup> that 'the Church, early in the second century, was 'ready to slide into the doctrine of a priesthood, with all its 'accompanying corruptions of Christian truth;'<sup>4</sup> a corruption so total, that 'now, the true and grand idea of a Church, that 'is, a society for the purpose of making men like Christ,—earth 'like heaven,—the kingdoms of the world the kingdom of 'Christ,—is all lost;' a corruption so shocking, that 'if,' says Mr. Bunsen, 'an angel from heaven should manifest to me that, 'by introducing, or advocating, or merely favouring the introduction of such an episcopacy' (as should be esteemed, 'on principle and catholically,' necessary to the due constitution of

<sup>1</sup> Bunsen, p. 68.<sup>2</sup> Arnold, p. 58.<sup>3</sup> Arnold, Corresp. ii. 61.<sup>4</sup> Arnold, p. 123.<sup>5</sup> Arnold, Corresp. ii. 15.

the Church, and so to the full membership of Christians,) 'into any part of Germany, I should not only make the German nation glorious and powerful above all the nations of the world, but should successfully combat the unbelief, pantheism, and atheism of the day—I would *not* do it: so help me God. Amen.'

They claim to have discovered, instead of this immemorial, universal, episcopal constitution (episcopal, we mean, as a matter of 'principle and catholicity') *another*.

Of this newly discovered constitution, it does not matter though there should be no traces either in the writers of the early Church, or in the early Church institutions. Dr. Arnold does, indeed, *condescend* to adduce the writers of the early Church as witnesses to his hypothesis: but he takes good care that his readers should understand how great a condescension he makes in so doing.

'The chapter which I am now going to write,' he says, 'is, in truth, superfluous. Nay, although its particular object were proved ever so fully, yet this would be a less gain than loss, if any were by the nature of the argument encouraged to believe that we are to seek for our knowledge of Christianity any where else but in the Scriptures. What we find there is a part of Christianity, whether recognised as such or no in after ages: what we do not find there is no part of Christianity, however early or however general may have been the attempts to interpolate it.'—*Arnold*, p. 47.

In this temper he begins his examination of early writers. After adducing various passages from them, and applying to them, we cannot but think, more forced and unnatural modes of interpretation than any ordinary principles will justify, he concludes by rejoicing that he is 'spared the pain of believing' that Christianity was grossly corrupted in the very next generation after the Apostles by the men who professed themselves 'to be the Apostles' true followers.'<sup>2</sup> So that in the former passage he shows how little he is disposed to esteem even the universal voice of Christendom, unless it should coincide with his own individual views of Scriptural interpretation, whilst in the latter he almost proclaims how unhesitatingly he would have rejected even the most primitive records of the Post-Apostolic Church, if they had resisted his strong explanatory wrestings. Indeed, we can hardly conceive language stronger to this point than Dr. Arnold's in another place:

'Thus, then, as the Scriptures wholly disclaim these notions of a human priesthood; as the *perfection of knowledge to which they would have us aspire consists in rejecting such notions wholly*; it is strictly, as I said, superfluous to inquire into the opinions of early Christian writers, because, if these uphold the doctrine of the priesthood ever so strongly, it would but show

<sup>1</sup> Bunsen, *Corresp.* p. xlvii.

<sup>2</sup> Arnold, p. 117.



that the state of mind of which the Epistle to the Hebrews complains, was afterwards more universal, and more remote from Christian perfection.'—*Arnold*, p. 57.

Is there not something marvellous, as a mere piece of *natural history*, in the confidence with which this writer holds his own personal interpretations of Holy Scripture?

But we must allow writers of such powers to unfold their Church theory for themselves. It is in a beautiful passage, of which the following is an extract, that Mr. Bunsen begins the statement of his view.

'All religions whatever have for their inward ground that feeling of need which springs from the interruption of man's union with God by sin, and for their final object that re-union for which, however dimly and uncertainly, men were encouraged to hope. All their sacrifices were attempts at this restoration, founded on this hope. But it was not possible that such attempts should ever fully realise that to which they aspired; and this for two reasons: in the first place, because, if considered as mere symbolical outward acts, they could of course effect nothing in a matter where that which is essentially inward, namely, the moral disposition of the heart towards God, is concerned: and in the second place, because it was not in man's power really to consummate that inward act, which their outward sacrifices expressed. Perfect thankfulness is only possible for the man who feels himself perfectly at one with God; and, therefore, that divided feeling with respect to God, which, as we have said before, is the prominent feature in man's religious sentiment, prevents the feeling of separation, of sin, of alienation from God, from being ever permanently merged in thankfulness. And thus the soul, although thankful, and ready to offer itself in thankfulness as a living sacrifice unto God, is necessarily driven to the other pole. The desire of union awakens the sense of distance and of guilt; the sin-offering is felt to be needed. But on this side it is still more out of man's power to consummate the sacrifice. For to this end the perfect innocence and sinlessness of the sacrificer is, in the very first place, necessary; but how can any *man* lay claim to this? and, if not for himself, how then for others,—for the family, or the nation? The consciousness of sin, of imperfection, of alienation, accompanies the worshipper even to the altar. He surrenders his most cherished possession, he invokes upon the head of the victim which stands in his place all that vengeance of God with which his conscience tells him his own head is threatened: he even, in his madness, offers the head of his beloved child as a sacrifice to the offended Deity. But still in the heart abides the feeling of God's anger: every misfortune, every pain, every bereavement, is to him a witness of this wrath, of this alienation. . . . The great atonement, or *sin-offering*, of mankind was consummated by Christ, by means of his personal sacrifice: the great *thank-offering* of mankind became possible through Christ by means of the Spirit.'—*Bunsen*, pp. 6—10.

From these premises Mr. Bunsen thus draws his conclusion:—

'There can henceforth be no more human, and therefore typical, mediators between God and man; for the Mediator, the High Priest, is himself God: no more acts of mediation (sacrifices) can henceforth exist, as means of producing inward peace and satisfaction in the conscience, for the true sacrifice of atonement has once for all been offered, and the true sacrifice of thanksgiving is continually being offered.'—*Bunsen*, p. 11.

Dr. Arnold must be allowed to strike this point still more strongly, and for the purposes of the theory, more pertinently.

'Some there are who profess to join cordially in this doctrine, and ask who disputes it. So little do they understand the very tenets which they uphold! For they themselves dispute and deny it, inasmuch as they maintain that the sacraments are necessary to salvation, and that they can only be effectually administered by a man appointed after a certain form. And thus they set up again the human mediator, which is idolatry. . . . This dogma, then, of a human priesthood in Christ's Church, appointed to administer His sacraments, and thereby to mediate between God and man, from no reasonable or moral necessity, is a thing quite distinct from any exaggerated notions of the activity of government: it is not the excess of a beneficent truth, but it is, from first to last, considering that it is addressed to Christians, who have their Divine Priest and Mediator already, a mere error: and an error not merely speculative, but fraught with all manner of mischief, idolatrous and demoralizing, destructive of Christ's Church; injurious to Christ and to his Spirit; the worst and earliest form of Antichrist.'—*Arnold*, p. 19.

This is the first, great, palmary argument of both these writers. The single, complete High Priesthood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ utterly abolishes and makes impossible any other Priesthood; and, inasmuch as Priesthood, in its full and true signification defined by themselves, means any sort of mediation whatever between God and man, every possible claim of mediation, even the claim of certain persons having alone the right of administering Sacraments necessary to salvation, falls under the same condemnation,—is corrupt, idolatrous, demoralizing and antichristian.

But secondly, the Priesthood of our Lord, admitting every single Christian, of whatever rank or profession of life, directly and immediately to the access and approach of God, involves the Priesthood of every individual Christian.

'Christianity first gave to man's moral responsibility its true position, first made it the central feeling of the individual, and caused it to be felt as the inseparable appendage of the awful gift of personality. Thus far then had every individual man become a priest of the Most High, because morally responsible to Him alone. Man's whole life, in intercourse with the world, as well as in the direct worship of God, was to be a continual sacrifice, to form a portion of the great work of the Spirit of love, by whose influences mankind is restored, and the kingdom of truth and righteousness founded and advanced. . . . This is, according to our view, that priesthood which the apostle St. Peter ascribes to the whole Christian Church, a body of believers, under the designation of the true and elect Israel, when he says, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people: that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."—(1 Pet. ii. 9.)—*Bunsen*, p. 13.

Such is the entire Scriptural argument, as far as Scripture is adduced for the affirmative proof, and establishment of their theory, of these two great Apostles of the Church of the Future.

Dr. Arnold does indeed in his 2d chapter allege eight or nine passages of the Acts and Epistles; but it is not in order to add any weight to his direct argument, but to relieve it from the pressure of the objections which those passages might seem to bring against it. Mr. Bunsen does also make a cursory reference to a few more passages, (one of which references contains a most adroit evasion of the force of an important place of the Old Testament, Exod. xix. 6, to which we shall refer again,) but the others are slight and unimportant, and not alleged in any strict or argumentative way.

There can, of course, be no doubt, that this Theory is as complete as it is simple. What can be plainer? In the times of old, before our Lord's coming, there might have been typical mediators, whose various efforts of sacrifice indicated the difficulty felt by man in becoming at peace with God; but the sacrifice once offered, all believers approach equally and with equal authority and right to God. Henceforth believers, not as a Church, not as one in Christ, not as a body, but separately and singly, are in absolute possession of the entire christian estate. Each is, so to speak, a corporation sole, a Church. Each is, in position, title, privilege, equal to all the rest. The Holy Scriptures, on which alone everything is founded, belong alike to all. None has a right to hold that his views of interpretation are better or sounder than those of another. None can be entitled to impart to others what those others may not impart to him.

The theory is simple indeed, as a Theory of the Constitution of the Church: so simple, that we cannot find out in what points it differs from the broadest *Independentism*.

Nor do we forget in saying this, that Mr. Bunsen expressly protests against *Independentism*, and says of it that it 'forgets time and hour, and looks even upon the present, the hard won inheritance of centuries, as having absolutely no real existence. In this despair, it is for beginning everything afresh, as if the past had yielded no experience, and formed no institutions, as if no Christian state existed—led away in this by American orators, who, like many others before them, make a virtue of necessity.' Mr. Bunsen's is a sort of Conservative-*Independentism*. He would graft a pure *independentism* of theory upon an existing condition of government and subordination. He would avail himself practically of the order and organization which result from the theory which he condemns, whilst he maintains a theory from which order and organization could never possibly result.

So simple indeed is this theory, that we venture to assert, and will undertake to prove, that, if it be admitted to be, as

these writers claim, the entire constitutional Theory of the Church, there can be no Creed, there can be no Sacraments, there can be no spiritual Gift sufficiently ascertainable to be any ground of comfort to a believer, there can be no Unity, there can be no Church.

Government itself, as far as relates to religious matters, would seem, in spite of Dr. Arnold's elaborate argument on the subject, to be simple tyranny; and so, we conclude, must Mr. Bunsen think when he says that 'a free constitution *in the widest sense* of the words, is the condition of the realization and effectual exercise of the true priesthood in the Church, and of the preservation of the Church herself.'<sup>1</sup> Indeed, we hardly see why separate Christians are not kings, as well as priests, so as to render it as great an usurpation in the King of Prussia or the Queen of England to assume royal authority over their subjects, as for the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Bishop of London, to claim the Priesthood (on principle and catholically) over their Dioceses.

The following are the '*summa fastigia*' of Dr. Arnold's argument in favour of *government* in the Church of the Future.

'It is seen and generally acknowledged that men's physical welfare has been greatly promoted by the co-operation of a number of persons endowed with unlike powers and resources.'

'This co-operative principle was by Christianity to be applied to moral purposes, as it had long been to physical.'

'The object of Christian society relating to the improvement of the whole of our life, the natural and fit state of the Church is that it should be a sovereign society or commonwealth.'

'So long as the sovereign society is not Christian, and the Church is not sovereign, we have two powers alike designed to act upon the whole of our being, but acting often in opposition to one another. Of these powers, the one has wisdom, the other external force and influence.'

'The natural and true state of things then is, that this power and this wisdom should be united.'

'This is the perfect notion of a Christian Church.'—*Arnold*, pp. 6—10.

All this sounds very plausible and easy; not less plausible and easy than Cicero's famous notion of the origin of states, when the 'noble savage' was won by the eloquence of orators to relinquish barbarian life, to build cities, and submit to civilization; but how, we should like to ask, is the mass of Christians, all of equal right and privilege, all of equal claim to possess and interpret Scripture, all of equal right to hold, to think, to believe, to worship according to their separate royalty and priesthood, ever to be brought to this voluntary co-operation, in the force and strength of which they will be willing to obey, or able to

<sup>1</sup> Bunsen, p. 18.

enforce their joint decrees? And how will such joint decrees escape the charge of tyrannical interference with their said separate royalties and priesthoods, if they claim to overrule the free choice in point of belief, or worship, or anything that is religious (which are the sole objects of the co-operation), of those who have as good right and title as their governors?

Also how comes this mass of separate kings and priests to be able to be spoken of as '*the Church*'? We must, of course, suppose all the present bonds of union loosened—parishes, dioceses, the whole of the higher spiritual doctrines of the Sacraments abandoned, Christians assembled in separate Independent congregations, or broken up into still minuter subdivisions,—how, we ask, can it be imagined that we can call such a loose, scattered, disjointed, infusible mass, as this would be, *the Church*, and proceed to argue about it as if it were capable of sovereign power?

Again, if it were capable of power (which we deny), or being capable of it were able to exercise it without tyranny (which we deny again), or, being capable of exercising it justly, could exercise it without falling to pieces again, and at once, at the very first exercise of it (which we deny again),—how, we ask, could a democratic spiritual constitution like this combine in one with any secular constitution which the world knows, excepting a democracy?<sup>1</sup> And how could it conceivably hold its own, even with a democracy, while the secular and spiritual objects would needs be so diverse, the leaders of the respective powers so different, the struggles so tumultuous, and the powers of coercion so small? We know, indeed, that Dr. Arnold protests against all distinction of things into secular and spiritual, and tells us that such a distinction is 'utterly without foundation, 'for in one sense all things are secular, for they are done in 'time and on earth; in another, all things are spiritual, for they 'affect us morally either for the better or the worse, and so 'tend to make our spirits fitter for the society of God, or of his 'enemies.' But we really must, with all respect for the lamented writer, claim to regard this sort of writing as extravagant, and indicative only of the zeal and heat of the author, and his intense conviction of the soundness of his conclusions; for can it be denied that some things are *more secular* than others, and some *more spiritual*? that though, no doubt, there is no absolute barrier between the two subjects, as though the secular were not at

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting and curious to observe, how while the high Roman monarchical theory of Church government is apparently incompatible with all polities except such as are monarchical; and the Independent with all except such as are democratic; the Federal-Episcopal, or Cyprianic seems capable of an application as wide as that of Christianity itself.

all spiritual, or the spiritual not at all secular, yet that going to church and saying one's prayers verges more nearly to the spiritual side than eating one's breakfast, and *vice versa*?

From Government let us pass to *Doctrine*. We hold it to be equally impossible that this constitution of the Church of the Future should admit of a Creed.

This impossibility seems to us to arise directly, and follow necessarily, from the perfect independence of interpretation of Holy Scripture belonging to every believer.

Nor let it be supposed that unity of theological opinion would be as likely to be maintained as unity of political, or of scientific, or other sorts of opinion, without the intervention of any sort of authority, by the mere gravitation of the sentiments of the majority towards some common principles, of which none but paradoxical and exceptional minds could doubt. Such may well be the case in subjects where opinions are either derived by process of acknowledged reasoning from some acknowledged principles, or are capable of being tested continually by their application to the actual state of things. But the interpretation of Holy Scripture is unlike either of these. No principles of interpretation of these books can be laid down, or ever have been laid down, on which all will agree. No dogmas ever have been, or can be derived from those books, which multitudes have not denied. No single truth, moral or divine, with the exception of the mere being of God, can boast to have been drawn from Holy Scripture with the unanimous consent of all who have called themselves Christians—of all who would have a right to claim, not a vote only, but an equality of rightness, truth, and privilege, according to the Bunsenian Constitution of the Future Church.

Accordingly we find in these writers a very consistent laxity on the subject of creeds. Dr. Arnold's work, being a fragment, does not reach any formal discussion of the subject of doctrine. Yet we find him saying, in a tone which well indicates the manner in which he would have treated that subject, if he had dealt with it directly,—

'A great point is gained when we understand that the heresies condemned by the Apostles were not mere erroneous opinions on some theological truth, but absolute perversions of Christian holiness: that they were not so much false as wicked. And further, where there was a false opinion in the heresy, it was of so monstrous a character, and so directly connected with profligacy of life, that it admits of no comparison with the so-called heresies of later ages. . . . In the Arian controversy, and in all others which have since arisen among Christians, the question has turned upon the true interpretation of the Apostles' words; but both parties have alike acknowledged that what the Apostles taught was to be received as the undoubted rule of faith and of action. Not so, however, the real heretics of the first century.'—*Arnold*, p. 89.



Is it possible to draw any other conclusion from this passage than that, in the author's mind, there can be no heresy<sup>1</sup> in those who acknowledge that what the Apostles taught is to be received as the undoubted rule of faith and action?—*i.e.* that Scriptural interpretation is an absolutely open field, in which as there can be no heresy, so there can be no authoritative truth?

Mr. Bunsen has two methods of dealing with Christian doctrine. The one philosophical; the norm of which may be gathered from the following sentence:—

'It can never be repeated too often, or expressed too emphatically, that the Protestant Church, by regarding piety and morality as identical terms, by assuming the religious and moral feelings of man to be inseparably united in their deepest roots, has bound herself to discover and demonstrate the *ethical exponent* of every *objective expression* respecting the relation of man to God.'—*Bunsen*, p. 33.

Does any reader desire a few specimens of the art of *ethical exposition of objective doctrines*? Here are a few with which this volume casually furnishes us. The Church of Christ; 'Emancipated Humanity,' (p. 224). Catholicity; 'Believing Humanity as one in its Divine Redeemer,' (p. 216). Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ; 'Humanity set free by the Word and the Spirit,' (p. 192). Universal Priesthood of Christians; 'The general moral responsibility to God of every individual,' (p. 32), or, *aliter*, 'the postulate that faith in the Holy Spirit is capable of being realized,' (p. 21). Episcopacy; 'The personal Conscience,' (p. 69). The kingdom of God; 'The moral order of the world,' (p. 35). The body of Christ; 'Humanity adopted into the Divine fellowship,' (217).

We should have thought that there would have been little need of any further doctoring of doctrine than this philosophical method would have furnished. Reduced to such a gaseous form, sublimed and bubble-blown into next to nothing, expounded

<sup>1</sup> How broadly and clearly Dr. Arnold held this opinion is plain from a remarkable letter in his Correspondence (Letter cxxxvi.), in which he says,— 'The differences between Christian and Christian are not moral differences, except accidentally; and that is what I meant in that passage in the Church Reform Pamphlet which you, in common with many others, have taken in a sense which I should wholly disclaim. An Unitarian, as such, is a Christian; that is, if a man follows Christ's law, and believes his words, according to his conscientious sense of their meaning, he is a Christian; and though I may think he understands Christ's words amiss, yet that is a question of interpretation, and no more: the purpose of his heart and mind is to obey and be guided by Christ, and therefore he is a Christian. But I believe—if I err as to the matter-of-fact, I shall greatly rejoice—that Unitarianism happens to contain many persons who are only Unitarians negatively, as not being Trinitarians; and I question whether these follow Christ with enough of sincerity and obedience to entitle them to be called Christians.' This last sentence appears to us to be extremely remarkable, whether it be considered in respect of logic, candour, or charity.

thus ethically into nothing more nor less than our own separate selves, with our own personal notions and moralities, doctrine is rendered so completely harmless, that we cannot understand why it is worth while, even if it be not inconsistent and unintelligible, to make a separate historical crusade against doctrine as such.

But Mr. Bunsen is not satisfied. He complains that the Protestant Churches, for the last three hundred years, have taken up the same one-sided view as the Clergy of the earlier Church for a thousand (fifteen hundred?) years before;—the ‘notion, that is, that Christianity is in the very first place a *doctrine*, and that unity of doctrine, that is, of a theological system, is the condition of the development of the Church in every other respect.’—*Bunsen*, p. 19.

Thus, then, we might suppose, that what with philosophy, what with anti-dogmatism, and what with the independent right of kings and priests to interpret, Mr. Bunsen had swept away all creeds whatsoever, and left the field as clear of doctrine as we have seen it made of government. But no: we must not do injustice. The very same paragraph from which we have extracted the last sentence contains the very thing which we had imagined to be annihilated—to be impossible—to have become an absurdity;—the *Symbolum Bunsenianum* itself.

‘The eternal, indestructible foundation and object of Christian faith is formed by three acts of God himself:—the act of creation, by which the world was called into existence, and man made in the image of God; the act of redemption, through Christ the God-man; and the act of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost to be the Guide of the mind of the Church, and the supreme Witness for that which is testified to us by history’—(1 John v.)—*Bunsen*, p. 18.

We trust that our readers will give us credit for the self-command with which we waive all more particular notice of the audacity and presumption with which this ‘Apostle of the Church of the Future’ takes upon him to shear away from the glorious and venerable creed of the true Apostles, every word (such as ‘Father,’ ‘only-begotten Son,’ ‘our Lord,’ &c.) which contains *truth* in contradistinction to *act*, so as to enable him, with the least semblance of consistency to retain some shadow of an objective religion at the very time when his arguments have seemed to sweep away all doctrines whatever from the Church. But we really must ask, what right has Mr. Bunsen, after all his arguments, to use in his creed the words God-man? What possible warrant can he have, in defiance of all Church history, to disallow the existence of Arian, Unitarian, and Socinian opinions, by introducing the *doctrine* of the Divinity of our Lord into his miserable creed of Divine Acts? Why has not the Arian,

whom, as we have seen, Dr. Arnold will not allow to be called a heretic, because he differs from the Church in interpretation only, being a king and a priest, as good a right to his opinion, and as good a right to be true in holding it, as Mr. Bunsen himself? To ourselves, the inconsistency involved in this introduction of doctrine, properly so called, into the objective creed of the Church of the Future, and the consequent exclusion of Arians and Socinians from the fellowship of so comprehensive a multitude, is perfectly incomprehensible,—perfectly incomprehensible on every principle save one, and that one which we doubt whether the writer will admit,—namely, that he is a better Christian than logician;—that his instinctive reverence for Christian truth shudders and recoils from the faithful application of his own principle, and that he cannot bear his own necessary and most miserable conclusion.

From Doctrine we must proceed to Ordinances. It appears to us to be perfectly impossible that ‘the Church of the Future’ can retain Sacraments, as rites, in any real manner conferring supernatural gifts. It may, no doubt, have a thing which it may call Baptism, which it may administer as the initiation of a heathen into Independent Christianity; and it may dignify some religious meal with the sacred name of the Holy Communion, but Sacraments, in the sense in which the Church has always understood them, Sacraments in which outward and visible signs are the means and the pledge of inward and spiritual graces, it cannot have.

Nor do they claim them. In Dr. Arnold’s book are various scattered sayings about Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, which plainly show what sort of things they are in the mind of an apostle of the free Church of the Future.

‘The repentance and faith of the person baptized, through God’s mercy in Christ, saves him. . . . The whole importance of Baptism, in his (S. Barnabas’s) eyes, must have consisted in the real change of heart which it implied, and the change of heart of which it was the beginning; and the ceremony of baptizing with water was merely a symbol of the great and important change which a man underwent in passing from a state of heathenism to Christianity. . . . God’s grace is conveyed to men’ (in the so-called Sacraments), ‘morally, because the joining of Christ’s Church in the first instance, and the constantly refreshing our communion with it afterwards, are actions highly beneficial to our moral nature. . . . Christians have been baptized with water, as an introduction into Christ’s service.’—Pp. 53, 62, 63, 78.

The following are some of the expressions of the same writer respecting the other Sacrament:—

‘When Christians met together and received the bread and wine of their common living as the body and blood of Christ, such an act had a real tendency to strengthen and confirm their souls, and the Holy Spirit made such

a communion a constant means of grace to those who partook of it. . . . The bread and wine became the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood, according to Christ's ordinance, by the assembled Church receiving them as such; by their converting an act of nature into an act of religion; by their agreeing to partake together as of their earthly food, so also of their spiritual, and thus being joined to one another in Christ. The agreement, therefore, of thus communicating, their common faith and love constitute the real consecration of the bread and wine: it is this, which, through Christ's Spirit, changes the Supper into the Sacrament. . . . He commanded us to eat, *as it were*, his flesh. . . . The communion was intended to keep in memory the death of our Lord, and through our memory to strengthen our faith, and so to make us actually and personally partakers in the benefits of his death.'—Pp. 20, 21, 77, 97.

Now let us not be misunderstood. We readily acknowledge that several of the expressions which we have quoted may be innocently and rightly used;—innocently and rightly used, that is, by those who have elsewhere acknowledged the deeper and truer doctrine of the Sacraments: but when they are given as *the* doctrine, the whole, the contradistinguished doctrine, then we say confidently that the scheme to which they belong contains no Sacraments at all, no Sacraments in the sense of the Catholic Church, no Sacraments in the sense of the Church of England, no Sacraments in such sense as can give to individuals in the Church any comfortable hope of their possessing any Divine, spiritual, supernatural gift.

It is not our intention to enter into discussion of the Christian Sacraments with these writers. We desire to confine ourselves to this single point, that such Sacraments as they teach, being not the *means whereby we receive spiritual grace*, are, by consequence, *no pledge to assure us of our having received it*.—These Catholic *means* being annulled, and none, that is, none which are visible, being substituted in their place, there can be no pledge at all, for the very essence of a pledge is to be visible and ascertainable. Means, then, of grace, that is, voluntary, practicable means, such as men may avail themselves of, and such as God hath promised to accompany with his vital, life giving grace, being annulled,—and pledges, that is, visible ascertainable proofs, guarantees of our having received what is invisible and not ascertainable, being done away likewise,—*at least*, all assurance and comfort of supernatural gift is destroyed also. For no man can, on this system, do battle against the smallest real inward doubt which rises in his mind. As long, indeed, as a man has no doubts, of course he may believe anything,—whether true or false, real or absurd,—and so, he may believe himself to be born again of the Holy Ghost, to be a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. But, when doubt comes; when sin comes, engendering doubt; or when gainsayers come; how is he then

to maintain, or to prove, or to comfort himself in the assurance of these *supernatural* gifts? How shall a man be *naturally* convinced that he possesses that which is *supernatural*?

Shall we be told that the blessing depends on faith, and that a man *can* ascertain his own faith?—We reply that it is impossible: impossible, that is, in the times when the proof and guarantee are most needed, the times of self-accusation, uneasiness, and doubtfulness.

We do not add a hundred other considerations which crowd into our mind,—the miserable uncertainty as to the *degree* of undoubtingness requisite to win the blessing,—the miserable uncertainty as to whether a man is deceived or no,—the miserable uncertainty as to the purity of the motives under which we are endeavouring to believe,—the miserable uncertainty as to the extent to which subsequent sin may have interrupted, or prevented the supernatural influences,—the miserable mischief of making men's hopes and comforts, and with them their cheerful daily duty and worship depend on a perpetual self-dissection, a continual laying bare of the inward workings of their own minds,—a daily feeling of the pulse, as it were, of the heart's faith, all hope and happiness being ready to despair and die the instant that pulse should seem to fail under the finger, while no love, nor faith, nor feeling can help dying under such melancholy and unnatural culture;—we do not enlarge on all these and innumerable other such like considerations, but we merely insist, that if the workings of our own minds, wherein supernatural movements are not capable of being distinguished from natural ones, are to be appealed to as the pledge of our possessing supernatural gifts, that this is merely a round-about way of dismissing supernatural gifts from this scheme of religion altogether. Supernatural gifts, undistinguishable from natural, are, to us, not other than natural. Supernatural gifts, not exhibiting themselves in supernatural powers, and yet not divinely attached to external ordinance as to a divine means and pledge of their being imparted, are not distinguishable from natural. Therefore, it appears to us demonstrable, that he who does away with the Catholic character of the Sacraments, the character whereby they are the sure means, and unfailing pledge of Divine invisible grace, does necessarily demolish everything that is supernatural in Christianity. He may talk of the Holy Spirit, of the new birth, of all the high spiritual mysteries belonging to Christian religion, but it can only be words, opinions, fancies. A gift, determined to himself, capable of being appealed to in times of trial, pledged, and real,—a gift capable of being a happiness and comfort in the days when the heart feels no strength, and is ready, as far as its inner feelings

go, to sink into the depths of despair, he cannot feel that he has. When faith or certainty is the only ground of comfort, uneasiness and doubt must needs be despair and misery. It appears to be demonstrable that in these distant ages and countries, when supernatural gifts no longer manifest themselves in supernatural powers, the belief in outward ordinances as the visible means and pledge of supernatural grace, and in a succession of men from the apostles authorized to administer such ordinances, are absolutely essential to the belief in supernatural graces themselves; and by consequence that the Priesthood and Sacraments are the only security against a system not always of intentional, but always of pure and essential naturalism.<sup>1</sup>

We are distressed to find a writer like Dr. Arnold urging against the Catholic doctrine such (must we not call them?) vulgar objections as that we cannot be saved by 'the outward rite of immersion in water,' that 'it is not rationalism, but reason resting on faith, which assures us of the utter incapability of any outward bodily action to produce in us an inward spiritual effect.' Against whom could he suppose that he was writing? Who ever dreamed of attributing to the outward rite of immersion, or any outward bodily action, any proper power at all upon the soul of man, or of doubting the justice of the poet's sentiment—

'O! faciles animi qui tristia crimina cædis  
Tolli flumineâ posse putetis aquâ!'

But where is the impossibility of *His* attaching spiritual blessings to outward ordinances who bade the blind man go and wash in the pool of Siloam and return seeing,—that is to say, who by His divine power gave efficacy to means naturally most inadequate, in the cure of bodily ailments? Is it not mere childishness (not to say more) to ask, as Dr. Arnold does against Hooker in respect of this very instance, 'Is it in the slightest degree a parallel case, that because a bodily application was *prescribed as a cure for a bodily disease* (1), it should therefore cure a disease of the soul?' Where is the unlikelihood of His attaching spiritual blessings to outward ordinances, who desired that His people should have peace in believing in every age? No doubt the washing in Siloam will not prove, of its own proper logical force, the sacramental efficacy of Holy Baptism, but, no doubt also, when that efficacy has its sufficient proof elsewhere, this divine act may rationally, logically, and forcibly

<sup>1</sup> From the correspondence (vol. ii. pp. 141, 169, 256), it appears that Dr. Arnold and the Chevalier Bunsen were not entirely agreed about the Sacraments. The points of difference are not made clear, but it would seem the views of Mr. Bunsen were higher than those of his friend.



be quoted in illustration and support of it, and in the overthrow and silencing of its gainsayers.

But it is necessary to draw this portion of our remarks to a close, and therefore we shall add no more in proof of our position that the constitution of the Church of the Future, as laid down by these two authors, admits not of government, or doctrine, or ordinances, or supernatural gifts, or unity, or peace, or any Church.

But before we conclude, it is necessary, in all candour, to deal with the Theory in a more direct manner. Adding no more as to its own inherent defects, we must in all propriety add a few observations in reply to it, as an attack upon the Catholic Theory.

No Catholic Christian would think of denying or doubting the truth of the two great doctrines which, as we have explained above, form the entire Church Theory of these writers: the one, the Single Priesthood, and by consequence, the single Sacrifice of our blessed Lord;—the other, the consequent Priesthood, so to call it, that is, the unimpeded access to God of every believer.

We not only do not deny, nor doubt these truths, but we vindicate and maintain them as truths of the most vital and deep importance; and also as truths which the Catholic Church has always vindicated and maintained with the utmost vigilance and care.

But these writers think that these two truths, of their own simple force and power, do at once and of necessity destroy and render impossible the Christian Priesthood and its offices.

With the whole Catholic Church of Christ, from the day of the Resurrection, we utterly deny the inference. We hold the two truths not less firmly than the apostles of the Church of the Future; we utterly repudiate, and will undertake to disprove the force of the conclusion.

We must take them separately.

Does the single Priesthood of Christ make all priesthood of men, that is, all special appointments of men to do acts necessary to the souls of other men, impossible, antichristian, and idolatrous?

Surely, no. For in the first place, why should it? If the claimed Priesthood of men be given in order to enable them to do *other things*, different from those which the Single Priest has done singly, and once for all, the supposed incompatibility of the two Priesthoods seems to disappear at once.—Granted, that the Sacrifice of our blessed Lord is the single and only proper meritorious sacrifice, and He the single and only Priest who could make atonement to God for man, how does this great truth disprove the possibility of His entrusting to His apostles,

and a succession of persons after them, the peculiar office of administering the outward rites to which Regeneration and the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ may be, by the covenanted mercy of God, attached? We cannot see the *elenchus*. We cannot find it. *There is none*, except it be drawn (as these writers draw it) from an ingenious *definition* of Priesthood, which, not confining it to the sense in which our Lord is the single Priest, but making it comprehend all possible intervention of means between man and God, then proceeds, easily enough, to disprove a particular sort of intervention.

But not only does the fact of the Single Priesthood of Christ fail to demonstrate from its own proper logical force and cogency, the modified and subordinate Priesthood of men, but also there are facts in the history of God's dealings with His people which seem to show plainly that some interventions between the soul of man and God have been possible and permissible without any such idolatrous and antichristian result.

In the first place (and for this argument we are indebted to the vigorous pages of Mr. Barter<sup>1</sup>) St. Paul did, on repeated occasions, recognise the Jewish Priesthood and sacrifices, subsequently to his conversion, as the other Apostles did also by their continual attendance at the Temple worship, and by their conduct recorded in the Acts xxi. 24. Now we do not wish to press this point too far, nor to enter into the various encumbering considerations by which it is surrounded; but thus much seems to us to be clear and undeniable; that it cannot be, *ipso facto*, idolatrous and unchristian to think of such a thing as a priest, or an intervening party between the worshipper and God, subsequently to the Crucifixion, without involving S. Paul, and the other Apostles, in such heinous guilt.

Will it be said that this was merely the dying out of old types, the old prophetic ritual almost gone, and, although in actual date it outlived the fulfilment, still rightly to be regarded as typical and prophetic '*ex parte post*'?

We doubt whether our opponents would gain anything,—whether they would not rather lose much by such a view. For not only does the cogency of our last conclusion remain undiminished, but if a typical priesthood might last for a few years after the Crucifixion without guilt, we cannot see why other subordinate priesthoods might not continue throughout the whole Church's history. Are not commemorations after an event somewhat akin to types before it? May not a Priesthood of Commemorations be analogous to a Priesthood of Types? Do our opponents acknowledge the true Priesthood of the

---

<sup>1</sup> 'The Gainsaying of Core,' by the Rev. W. B. Barter.

Jewish Priests? But how do they reconcile it with the doctrine of Rev. xiii. 8, of 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world?' There never was, or could be, more than One real, true Priest. This is He who hath an unchangeable Priesthood, who offered Himself before the foundation of the world, in the faith of whom the ancient Patriarchs lived and died. But if the Jewish Priesthood of Types be compatible<sup>1</sup> with this Single Omni-temporal Priesthood, and if the continuance of this Priesthood of Types for a few years even after this Priesthood had become visible, had taken place and position in the chronology and geography of the world, and had consummated the Sacrifice upon the Hill of Calvary, be not incompatible with it either,—then we think that all ground of reason and show of argument is cut away from those who presume to say that the Single Priesthood of Christ renders idolatrous and antichristian every possible intervention of appointed men in the intercourse of other men's souls with God.

The question of priesthood, then, becomes a question, not of reason, but of fact. Into *that* question we have not present occasion to enter. We will only observe respecting it, that it appears to us beyond measure surprising that, in investigating an historical question of fact, such as this, two such able and experienced historians should deliberately overlook the evidence of *institutions* (such as Church politics and liturgies), of institutions, so long maintained, so difficult to alter, so well supplying the scanty and imperfect, and sometimes contradictory testimony of books, and content themselves with a theory built on *à priori* grounds, and, by means of many a painful and paradoxical interpretation, exhibited as *not contrary* to the few and scattered relics of the first age.

But it is also said, that the complete Priesthood of every believer, that is, the full and free access to God, purchased for every single Christian by the sacrifice of Christ, is equally destructive of the claim of Priesthood on the part of any separate class.

1. Surely, in the first place, there is no necessary reason whatever why, whilst general approach and access to God, as in confession and prayer, may be freely and *directly* granted to all, certain particular blessings may be imparted to them *indirectly*, that is, through the agency of others. There is, as we say, not only no necessary reason why it should not be so, but every reason of analogy, both in the natural and earlier revealed doings of God with man why it should.

<sup>1</sup> Sacerdotium Leviticum—habebat imaginem, non veritatem, futuri cujusdam Sacerdotis.—S. August. Enarr. in Ps. xxxvi. 2.

2. Secondly, if there be, in Christian religion, *ordinances*, conferring supernatural graces, it appears to us to be necessary that there should be persons to administer them, and those, inheritors by direct descent of those to whom the power was originally imparted by the hand of the Apostles. If it were otherwise, no persons could have adequate security of their possessing the invisible graces, or be able to comfort themselves in the times of uneasiness and doubt. We anticipate here the objection which may be thought to rise from the difficult question of 'lay baptism.' But, in fact, there is no real weight in such an objection, partly because the Church never held the full validity of lay, or heretical baptism, *without confirmation*, and partly because the question of lay baptism owed all its difficulty to the fact that baptism, from its essential nature, does not admit of repetition. So little ground does there seem to be for an off-hand saying of Dr. Arnold, in his correspondence, 'Lay baptism was allowed by Hooker to be valid, and no distinction can be drawn between one Sacrament and the other. (Corresp. ii. 53.)

3. Thirdly, the example of the Jewish people bears directly upon the case, and with a force, when all the points of it are considered, which seems to us irresistible. In the third month, 'when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai, and there Israel camped before the mount. And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him, out of the mountain, saying, 'Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel, Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice, indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people, for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.' Now here we have the very same thing said of the children of Israel, which S. Peter, referring to this very passage, says afterwards of Christians, which saying forms the Scriptural groundwork of the constitution of the Church of the Future. Mr. Bunsen, with great adroitness, slurs the difficulty over; for having quoted the place of S. Peter, he thus proceeds. 'In this was accomplished that promise which God made to the Jews by his servant Moses, to be to them a light along that dark path of law and legalism which they were so long to pursue: And ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.' (Exod. xix. 6.)

But what possible ground of reason can Mr. Bunsen adduce for interpreting these words so exclusively prophetically as to

deny their obvious application, in the first place, to the children of Israel themselves? Granting that their full meaning did not come out, until believers, by being made members of Christ in Holy Baptism, became, in a new and full sense, 'a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation;' how can we grant, in defiance, we believe, of all expositors, in defiance of the obvious sense of the words spoken so solemnly, so publicly, so early,—at the very inauguration of the Jewish nation,—in defiance of the plain interpretation of the Jews themselves, that they do not apply to the children of Israel, at least in a primary and inchoate manner, before the days of the Messiah?

Did not the children of Israel so interpret them? What then was the meaning of Korah the Levite, and Dathan and Abiram, 'the Reubenites, when they rose up before Moses, with certain 'of the children of Israel, two hundred and fifty princes of the 'assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown, and 'gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, 'and said unto them, Ye take too much upon you, *seeing all the 'congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among 'them, wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congrega- 'tion of the Lord?*' (Numbers xvi.) They had recently heard the solemn declaration made by God through Moses: they knew the promise of God to make them a kingdom of priests and a holy nation, and so they banded, Levites and Reubenites, with men apparently of various tribes, to denounce what they esteemed an usurping priesthood, that presumed to come between them and God; who, by speaking to them as He had done, and being among them, had given them the blessing of direct approach, and given them each his separate and royal priesthood. Korah<sup>1</sup>, Dathan, and Abiram, were undoubtedly right in their premise. The congregation *was* holy, and the Lord *was* among them; but they were wrong and rebellious in their inference. The holiness and priesthood of the congregation did not, of their own proper logical power and force, disprove the peculiar office and priesthood of Aaron and his sons. And so we fear it may be now. The apostles of the Church of the Future are right in their premise. Christians *are* priests and kings, as members of Christ. But is there no fear of their incurring the danger of the gainsaying of Core, if they draw Core's inference? No fear of tempting Christ by dishonouring Him in His priests?

For be it observed that S. Peter's warning against the gainsaying of Core would be an idle and useless warning, if such sin could not be committed in Christian days; and it could not be committed, if the universal priesthood did really put every

<sup>1</sup> A strange use of the instance of Korah, the Levite, will be found made in Vol. ii. p. 104 of Dr. Arnold's Correspondence.

member of the Christian Church into precisely the same position of spiritual privilege and office.

The same observation may be extended to S. Paul's lesson in the 10th Chapter of the 1st of Corinthians. The history of the Jews in the wilderness was written for our example, on whom the ends of the world are come. Every act of disobedience and lawlessness of theirs was recorded, because Christians are tempted to the like; they are all recorded to the intent that we should, by their example, refrain from sin—the five great sins in the Christian Church; luxury, idolatry, fornication, tempting Christ, and murmuring—which last, though it may not exclude the continual murmurings of the people, as for water, does undoubtedly include, and that in a primary and especial manner, the murmuring of the great Levites and Reubenites against the Aaronic priesthood.

But are we to conclude that there is really no difficulty in the Catholic theory in the points on which these writers appear to us to have made so miserable wreck? Is it obvious and clear at the first sight, how the full and true Priesthood and Royalty of single believers, is compatible with the claimed Priesthood and power in the Church of the successors of the Apostles? Unquestionably not: and we think that we should not adequately conclude this hasty sketch of the argument whereby we believe these gainsayers to be really answered, if we did not freely acknowledge the difficulty, and offer what we believe to be the Catholic solution of it.

The Apostles, in whom all the original powers and privileges of the Church were vested, held, as is plain, two characters. They are partly representatives of the Church, and partly its rulers: that is, some of the things said to them were said to them as to the Church at large, and so to all and every member of the Church, and some more personally, as to those by whom the Church, when it came to consist of more members, was to be governed. The difficulty arises from the difficulty of discriminating between these different sayings.

This very difficulty, we conceive to have been urged by the apostle S. Peter to the Lord himself, when, after the parable of the servants watching for their lord when he should return from the wedding, he asks 'Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even unto all?'<sup>1</sup> In our Lord's answer he appears to acknowledge plainly that the preceding parable was spoken with an application to the Apostles as governors or stewards of the Church. 'And the Lord said, who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his lord shall make ruler over his

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Luke xii. 41.



‘household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? ‘Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you that he will make ‘him ruler over all that he hath.’

Here then we find not only that there are to be rulers and stewards of God’s Church during the time of the Lord’s absence, and they, entrusted with power to judge of the seasons in which spiritual meat should be apportioned to his people, but what is still more remarkable, that this authority is not to cease when the Lord returns to establish his triumphant kingdom. The steward who has discharged his office well in the temporary state, shall be ruler over all that his Lord hath in the eternal. This promise of *power* as one of the characteristic blessings of the state of the saints in heaven, is remarkably illustrated by various other passages, such as S. Matthew xxiv. 47 ; xxv. 21, 23, 24 ; xix. 28 ; S. Luke xix. 17, 19 ; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3 ; &c.

Now all that we wish to conclude from this passage is this ; that although by the admission of individuals into the Body of Christ, they do really become, each one of them, partakers of all the glorious privileges which belong to that estate, and among the rest of these privileges that of Royalty, as Christ is Royal, and the only King (according to the teaching of S. Peter, in the passage we have already often referred to, and Rev. i. 6, and v. 10), yet that Royalty is entirely compatible with the existence of authority of various kinds, and among others, such as we specifically call royal authority among them.

Nor compatible only : it actually requires (and that not temporarily, and for mere cohesion’s sake, for thus much of needful authority, as a human necessity, Dr. Arnold grants) subordination and superiority, and with these, obedience, and authoritativeness on the part of the individuals who hold this lofty position.

For the individuals are kings, not as separately created, independent potentates, but inasmuch, and so far forth, as they are One in Christ the King. It is the One in Christ that is the King. It is the unity that is royal. They are the separate atoms which compose the unity. Kings, indeed, they are, as the separate atoms of the royal unity. But the instant that they try to dis sever, and maintain apart their single royalties from that of the unity in which alone they reign, they do, ipso facto, break the unity, and breaking it lose the very claim they make. As then the Body is one, and has many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. Theirs is no voluntary association of independent powers ; no alliance for mutual security, or advantage of sepa-

rate or separable estates; no natural or reasonable conjunction, such as Dr. Arnold argues for, of 'corporations sole' for purposes of more extended good or benefit. On the contrary, their individual powers depend absolutely on the collective power, and exist only therein: without it they are rebels, Dathans, Korahs; within it, they are kings in the royal unity which is Christ, and whereof Christ is the Head.

Now it does not in any degree interfere with this view to believe that the Lord (when leaving the world in the flesh, He began to be present with His Church in His Spirit), should have left a *succession* of persons to exercise these authorities in His Church until the end of the world. We do not say (speaking for the present of the royalty alone,) that a succession is, *a priori*, the only possible way by which the requisite authority might have been obtained, nor that it would have been impossible (had such been the Divine will), for the Royal Body to have evolved, in each generation, from itself the powers requisite for its own government; nor, again, for the Royal Body (supposing the Divine succession by any circumstance, or accident, broken or interrupted,) to begin a fresh succession, either absolutely, or in isolated portions of the world. We do not say this; but we say that there is nothing whatever in the view of a perpetual *succession* of these powers within the Church to add any new difficulty to the theory of the united royalty of the Church, participated by every individual Christian.

As the real royalty of many individual Christians forms no argument against the real single royalty of the Church, One in Christ; and as the real single royalty of the Church, One in Christ, involves the necessary consequence of authority exercised over those who are truly kings; so this authority may, for any reason that can be adduced to the contrary, be determined to a series or succession of persons within the Church, selected each by their predecessor, and invested, according to the ordinance of God, with the peculiar authorities requisite to enable them to discharge their office.

What the nature of those peculiar authorities will be, it is, perhaps, difficult to state, in the *a priori* manner in which we are now arguing. But we may safely say that they will comprise at least the following particulars; authority of admission and of expulsion; *i. e.* authority of making, and deposing individual royalties;—authority of correction and punishment, these being the necessary forerunners and preparations of expulsion;—authority of guiding and teaching;—of defending, strengthening, and supporting, in all ways in which they may need it, the separate and single royalties, by bringing to bear on

them the discretion, strength, and weight of the collective royalty acting in its chief officers.

We may appear to have been wasting effort and argument here on an acknowledged point. '*Quis dubitavit?*' we can readily suppose, may be asked by those who agree with Dr. Arnold's views, and remember how carefully he maintains the necessity of organization and government in every human society, and by consequence in the Church.

We do not, indeed, think that our argument is quite identical with Dr. Arnold's, even as far as we have yet conducted it; for on his view, government is a natural need, voluntarily submitted to by the separate independent regalities, for the purpose of obtaining certain further advantages than they can gain singly,—in ours it is an essential, original, divine portion of the Christian scheme, not destined to terminate with this life, out of which, and because of which, there descends to individuals all that separate character and privilege of royalty of which the Apostle speaks.

But our main object in putting forward *first* the single subject of the royalty of Christians is, that from it we may proceed to the parallel and more controverted subject of their priesthood. For in all the passages (Exod. xix. ; 1 S. Peter ii. ; Rev. i. and v.) in which the royalty of Christians is spoken of, their priesthood is spoken of too; nor can we see anything in the one subject which should render the views inapplicable to it which are applicable to the other.

For, in the first place, Christians derive their priesthood as they derive their royalty, solely from being one in Christ. He is the true single priest: priest and victim: at once the lamb slain from the foundation of the world, and the only omnipotent priest. There never was, nor could be, true victim but he; there never was, nor could be, true priest but he. But his body, which is the Church, is endowed with all the same glorious privileges as himself. One in him, she is the heir of Abraham (Gal. iii. 16, 28), she is royal, and she is priestly. Not independently of him, God forbid! but in him and by him she may approach as a priest to God, with access unimpeded, without need of further mediators, and God will hear and recognise and receive her priestly acts.

And so there descends to the separate members of this priestly body, because, and by force of their being members of it, the same priestly character. Each single one among them may now, in the great day of the Church, approach to God. He may, in the retirement of his closet, bewail his secret sins, address God as 'our Father which art in heaven,' cry Abba Father with the confident hope of a beloved and accepted son,

not doubting that the fullest access has been won for him, and that God loves, tends, blesses him with not less care than if no other 'man nor angel lived in heaven or earth.' But his priestly character would disappear, and not be, if he tried to be a priest without the priestly unity; to be a member without the body, if he claimed that instead of sharing in a luminous atmosphere, in which he with others might walk and see God, there were determined to his single soul rays of separate and independent sonship which made him a priest of God irrespectively of the great unity of which he is a portion.

Whereinsoever then the individual priest needs support, instruction, guidance, assistance from the collective priesthood, there, we cannot doubt that some mode is likely to be provided by which he may be able to obtain it. And unspeakably shallow and unreal would be the system in which it should be maintained that there are no such needs, or that the single Christian is absolutely complete in these respects in himself alone. For not only must he derive in the first place, his priestly estate from the collective priesthood by being received in some manner, and at some specific time, into the Church, and owe to it his instruction in the truth of God, and his opportunity of partaking in whatever means of divine grace may belong to the common worship and devotion of Christians, in distinction from the separate prayers of a single individual; not only must he be liable to be deprived of his personal priesthood by the authority of that which is collective, and to be checked and controlled in various portions of the exercise of it, (for these are necessary parts of the power of deprivation,) but what is more and more exactly to our present point, he will sometimes need the aid and help of the collective priesthood even in such points as are most strictly and peculiarly priestly.

We grant that he has full and free access, as a member of Christ, to God in prayer. But what if he have sinned very heavily, and having been led to see the enormity of his offences, be led to despair of his retaining the access which he possessed before? The Church holds, as the Holy Scriptures teach, that there is some amount, degree, or kind of sin which is irremissible. If there be, then there must be degrees of sin, more and less easily remissible, leading up to this terrible consummation. There must be danger, before total loss: there must be conditions of deepening peril, conditions of decaying spiritual influence, conditions of diminishing facility of access, conditions of dwindled and still dwindling grace, and blessing, before the door of acceptance is finally closed, the day of grace done, and the doom of death even in life inevitable. And so it may possibly not be an unreasonable fear, which leads a sinner

awakened to the keenest remorse for long-continued and heinous sin,—doubtful of his own repentance, doubtful of his own faith, doubtful whether the bitterness which he feels be not rather a foretaste of hell than any token of still surviving acceptableness,—to tremble in his inner soul, and shrink, and despair of his retaining the priestliness of his original condition, and to feel most anxious dread lest the attempt of *such as he* to approach God in prayer might not add sacrilege to other sin, and only deepen his guilt and misery.

What then shall we do? Shall we mock the dying patient by reminding him that he is a physician himself? Shall we insult the despairing penitent by telling him that he is himself a priest? Shall we tyrannically imprison him in his own single faith, when the very disease under which he labours is despair? Shall we limit the mercy of Christ, who actually by his divine breath did communicate the Holy Ghost to his priests for the remission of sins, by our miserable *logic*, which, defining priesthood after a certain arbitrary manner, then proceeds to annul the promise and gift of Christ to his priests, and so to his penitents?

Nor does there appear to be the least difficulty in believing that the collective priesthood of the body of Christ may have been, by Christ and his Apostles, determined to a succession of men, holding by continually derived title of authority from their predecessors, so as to trace their power directly up to the Lord himself. We do not now argue that this is the *only* method whereby such collective priesthood could be efficiently or properly administered, or maintain that circumstances might not be conceived under which the priestly body, well assured that the sacred presence was within it (for that they were indeed two or three duly gathered into the sacred name, and so a Church), might evolve from itself its own collective priestly powers, and delegate them to some of its members, or recommence a broken succession. We do not now argue so, because it is not to our immediate point; but we maintain that if the body be collectively priestly, and if the collective priestliness of the body be capable of imparting priestly benefit to those who are, confessedly, individual priests, and if such benefits, being possible, are also likely and to be expected when they are needed,—and all these points we hope that we have proved,—then that there is no possible reason to be alleged why the particular officers whose duty it is to be the channels of these particular benefits may not be selected, appointed, and guaranteed by means of a perpetual succession. There is no incompatibility, no absurdity in reason, in supposing that the Church may have its divine succession of priests tracing up to

the Apostles, and so to the Lord himself, exercising the collective priesthood, even while every member of the Church is personally and truly a priest, when regarded by himself alone.

Let it not be thought that we are here arguing directly in favour of the succession as a matter of fact. *That* argument is to be maintained on different grounds,—grounds which we may confidently say are amply sufficient to support it against the attacks of all gainsayers. Our humbler object is to clear the historical argument from the rubbish of *à priori* objections, to do away with the shallow notion that they who hold the priesthood of individual Christians do thereby destroy and disprove all priesthood of ordained priests within the Church of God. We say then boldly, that if the collective priesthood be granted, no argument can be alleged to render it incredible or unlikely that the channels of that priestly power should be a succession of persons, deriving by perpetual ordination, and the gifts thereunto attached, from the Apostles and their Lord. If any person can prove it incredible, let him do so: we cannot undertake to remove difficulties which we have never heard, and cannot conceive.

One topic further, and we have done. It is possible that the theory of collective and individual priestliness, which we have here put forward, may seem new and strange to some readers; and they may be disposed to ask, ‘where is all this to be found?’ ‘who is the acknowledged church writer who has laid it all down in this manner, and whom you follow?’

Our answer is, that every part of our view will be found, as is essential to every Catholic view of truth, maintained and upheld by every writer of confessed authority, wherever that particular portion of doctrine comes, in the order of his work, to be presented to his mind. If the complete and balanced theory be less easy to find, this deficiency is easily to be accounted for, and easily to be supplied.

Indeed, we may confidently say, that, if there be any writer of acknowledged weight and authority in the Church from whose works passages have been, or can be, adduced which apparently favour the Arnoldian hypothesis (passages, that is, in which the individual priestliness is put forward so singly and so strongly as to *seem* to carry any denial of the collective), there will be found other passages, and probably in abundance, to show that such a negative inference is entirely inadmissible, and that the writer, in fact, held no other view than that which we have been attempting to sketch. He may, in the course of his argument, have had need to urge with separate force the great truth of the individual priestliness,—that great truth which, in the history of the church, has been so often overlaid,



forgotten, and usurped upon,—he may have wished to vindicate it from direct or indirect attacks to which it has been exposed; but we will undertake to prove that there is no writer of acknowledged catholic character who will be found so to have urged and insisted on the individual priestliness, as not, in the course of his doctrinal writings, to have acknowledged, and probably insisted upon, with equal or greater force, the other two truths of the connected theory, the collective priestliness, and the succession.

Take, for example, a passage of Tertullian (who *is* catholic, at least, on *this* point), which has been often used to favour the Arnoldian views, (we quote from an edition which makes it construe) ‘Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, ‘regnum quoque nos, et sacerdotes Deo et patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiæ auctoritas, et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus adeo, ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers, et tingis, et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici.’<sup>1</sup> When, then, we find this same writer saying repeatedly such other things as these:—‘Dandi quidem (baptismum) habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus, dehinc presbyteri et diaconi non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo, salva pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est, quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari potest.’<sup>2</sup> ‘Edant ergo (Hæretici) origines ecclesiarum suarum. Evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis, vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesiæ apostolicæ census suos deferunt.’<sup>3</sup>—how can we interpret these passages so as to make them compatible with each other without supposing that the writer had in his mind, even though he had not put the parts of it together in any single passage, the precise theory which we have endeavoured to sketch?—the collective priesthood of the church—the individual priesthood of single believers—the collective priesthood determined to a succession of priests by divine appointment?

Hooker, again, is expressly referred to by Mr. Bunsen as offering, at least, negative support to his theory, by the admission of the possibility, under extreme circumstances, of ordination taking place without a bishop; thereby, it is inferred, so fully acknowledging the priestly power to inhere essentially in individual Christians, as to warrant the denial of it to any particular officers, or series of officers in the church.

<sup>1</sup> De Exhort. Castitatis, c. vii.<sup>2</sup> De Bapt. c. xvii.<sup>3</sup> De Præs. Hær. c. xxxiii.

But how can this negative inference, which, be it observed, is the only thing which brings Hooker within the scope of Mr. Bunsen's argument, stand with the following passages of the same writer? (we quote from Mr. Keble's preface, p. lxxvi.):—  
 'What angel in heaven could have said to man, as our Lord did  
 'unto Peter, Feed my sheep; preach; baptize; do this in remembrance of me; whose sins ye retain, they are retained; and their offences in heaven pardoned, whose faults ye shall on earth forgive? What think ye? Are these terrestrial sounds, or else are they voices uttered out of the clouds above?  
 'The power of the ministry of God translateth out of darkness into glory; it raiseth men from the earth, and bringeth God himself down from heaven; by blessing visible elements, it maketh them invisible grace; it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; it hath to dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of the world, and that blood which was poured out to redeem souls; when it poureth malediction upon the heads of the wicked, they perish; when it revoketh the same, they revive. Oh wretched blindness if we admire not so great power; more wretched if we consider it aright, and notwithstanding imagine that any but God can bestow it.'<sup>1</sup> 'Let us not fear to be herein bold and peremptory, that if any thing in the church's government, surely the first institution of bishops was from heaven, was even of God: the Holy Ghost was the author of it.'<sup>2</sup>

We have quoted these two writers because they are most apt to be quoted upon the Arnoldian side in this controversy; but we confidently repeat that there is no writer of acknowledged authority who, acknowledging the individual priestliness, does not balance that acknowledgment in other parts of his writings by acknowledging also the collective priestliness, and the succession; which two points make up the connected theory which we have ventured to sketch. We will not quote other writers, who would be endless, but will content ourselves with one passage from Pope Leo, which seems to us to put the whole matter in a very clear and just light. 'Nam licet universa ecclesia Dei distinctis ordinata sit gradibus, ut ex diversis membris sacrati corporis subsistat integritas; omnes tamen, sicut ait apostolus, in Christo unum sumus: nec quisquam ab alterius ita divisus est officio, ut non ad connexionem pertineat capitis cujuslibet humilitas portionis. In unitate igitur fidei atque baptismatis, indiscreta nobis societas, dilectissimi, et generalis est dignitas, secundum illud beatissimi Petri Apostoli sacratissimâ voce dicentis; et ipsi tanquam lapides vivi superædificamini

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. Pol. vii. 14. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Eccl. Pol. v. 77. 1.

*'in domos spirituales, sacerdotium sanctum, offerentes spirituales hostias acceptabiles Deo per Jesum Christum. Et infra: Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, populus acquisitionis. Omnes enim in Christo regeneratos crucis signum efficit Reges, sancti vero Spiritus unctio consecrat sacerdotes: ut præter istam specialem nostri ministerii servitutem, universi spirituales et rationabiles Christiani agnoscant se regii generis, et sacerdotalis officii esse consortes. Quid enim tam regium, quam subditum Deo animum corporis sui esse rectorem? Et quid tam sacerdotale quam vovere Domino conscientiam puram, et immaculatas pietatis hostias de altari cordis offerre? Quod cum omnibus per Dei gratiam commune sit factum, religiosum tamen vobis atque laudabile est, de die provectionis nostræ quasi de proprio honore gaudere: ut unum celebretur in toto ecclesiæ corpore pontificii sacramentum, quod effuso benedictionis unguento, copiosius quidem in superiora profluxit, sed non parçè etiam in inferiora descendit.'*<sup>1</sup>

And here we might be content to leave these writers, and their theory, satisfied that the Church of England is still sufficiently sound at heart to reject teaching so utterly at variance with the whole body of primitive doctrine and discipline, but that the recent nomination of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford places in a still stronger light the actual danger in which the church is placed in this regard. It was fearful to think that the Chevalier Bunsen, besides his high character, learning, and station, had had influence enough with our governors in Church and State to effect the left-handed marriage of Anglicanism with Lutheranism which the church has seen exhibited in the establishment of the Bishopric in Jerusalem. It was fearful to think that Dr. Arnold's fresh, vivid style of correspondence, and his manly, soundhearted views of his office and duties as Master of Rugby School, had so won access for his destructive church theories, as to make his 'Remains' a sort of text-book on the church for statesmen, imperfectly informed upon the subject, and politically and liberally disinclined to the clergy of the Church of England, and their teaching. But the nomination by the Crown of Dr. Hampden for a bishopric brings the actual battle. Not content with setting on foot distant measures, or indicating a preference for heretical teachers, Lord John Russell has now thought proper to select the most notorious man in England,—notorious by having promulgated the dangerous opinions in the most conspicuous manner,—notorious by having been once and again condemned by

<sup>1</sup> Serm. iv. in Annivers. Assumpt. suæ.

the vote of the University of Oxford,—for the highest preferment in the heart of our own country, and to insist upon carrying this selection through, by the exercise of the royal prerogative, under the most odious act of a tyrannical period, in defiance of a very large body of the clergy and laity of the land headed by their bishops, and in a manner directly destructive of the spiritual rights of the church. Into the details of this appointment, and the correspondence and transactions to which it has given rise, we forbear to enter here; satisfying ourselves with expressing the hope that so insulting and extraordinary a challenge, on the part of the State to the Church, to relinquish both truth and freedom at its wanton bidding, can issue in nothing else than in the vindication of both; and that it is *impossible* for the Erastian, tyrannical, indefensible act of 25 Hen. VIII. to remain the law of a land, which, however little it may appreciate the truth of God, still claims to venerate, and makes large sacrifices to prove that it venerates, human liberality.

But we must add a few words, in order to show that the teaching of this bishop designate (alas! the day!) of Hereford, is, in all essential points, identical with that which we have been criticizing, of Messrs. Bunsen and Arnold,—identical, we say, in essential points; and to this essential identity we beg to call the particular attention of such of our readers as may have been mystified by the publications of Dr. Hampden, subsequent to the date of the censure of the University of Oxford. Since that date the cautious Professor has simply *held his tongue*, upon the philosophical and theoretical points involved in his former more scientific discussions. He has republished those discussions, indeed, referred to them, sold them, declined to withdraw or retract them; but his line in teaching, since that time, has been to waive the whole subject, to talk of Christian doctrines as if he had never cut off the very trunk by which they claim to be joined to the root of Christian truth; to throw out phrases, and use modes of speaking, musical in the ears of a certain party in the Church, in order, thereby, to turn to his own advantage the prejudice which, since the time of his own condemnation, has grown up against the High-Church Divines; and this ingenious method has had no inconsiderable success. Men of station and reputation talk of his '*virtual retraction*,' of his having been '*sufficiently punished*!' of the '*soundness of his present views*,' of the '*greater danger of Romanism*,' till they become, practically, apologists of a system of teaching, really destructive of the Creeds, the Sacraments, the Doctrines, the authority, and the very being of the Church.

Like Mr. Bunsen and Dr. Arnold, Dr. Hampden totally disallows the authority of the Creeds. Indeed, his Bampton

Lectures may be fairly understood to be an express attack upon them.

He holds that the entire matter of revelation is simply and solely *fact*: 'The only ancient, only catholic truth, is the 'scriptural fact.' 'Dogmas of theology, *as such*, are human 'authorities.'

Does he attempt, in the preface to the second edition of the Lectures, to evade the force of his own words, and explain the word '*fact*,' in such a manner as, by including doctrines, to nullify and stultify the whole discussion of the Bampton Lectures at a blow?

We will not characterize the candour and honesty of such a proceeding; but we will provide the due reply to it from his own words: 'I venture to say, there are no propositions concerning God in Scripture, detached from some event of Divine Providence to which they refer, and on which they are founded. 'Some, perhaps, will say, "An inspired writer has said thus, or thus,—this, then, as asserted by him, is matter-of-fact; and, accordingly, it is on matter-of-fact, in this sense, that the 'Christian revelation is said to be founded." *The expression, "matter-of-fact," will, no doubt, admit this sense; but, to interpret the Scripture revelation in this manner, is only to return to the assertion of its dogmatic character in another form. It brings us back to take the words, or propositions, written by the inspired writers, as the substance of the revelation, instead of looking to the authenticated dealings of God in the world. When I say, therefore, that the Christian revelation is matter-of-fact, I INTEND by it to express my conviction that the substance of the revelation is the DOINGS AND ACTIONS of God; I have always before my view some EVENT in the HISTORY of God's PROVIDENCES to which I refer it.*'

If Dr. Hampden's meaning is not ascertained, and his evasion not annihilated by himself (both of which we hold to be very satisfactorily accomplished), let us beg our readers to refer back to page 68 of this Number, in which an extract is made from Mr. Bunsen's 18th page.

Can any one doubt that the ACTS of Mr. Bunsen's Creed illustrate the FACTS of Dr. Hampden's?

Like Dr. Arnold, again, who cannot deny to the Unitarians the name of Christian, because they differ only in interpretation from the Church, Dr. Hampden, too, 'when he looks at the reception by the Unitarians, both of the Old and New Testament, cannot, for his part, strongly as he dislikes their theology,

<sup>1</sup> Bampton Lectures, iii. p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., viii. p. 375.

<sup>3</sup> It is a moral fact, of no slight significance, that this self-convicting passage is omitted in the second edition of the *Observations on Religious Dissent*, p. 14.

'deny to those, who acknowledge this basis of divine facts, the name of Christian.'

Dr. Hampden, indeed, in his crusade against Christian doctrine, outdoes even Dr. Arnold; for the actual words of Holy Writ itself are not safe from his miserable philosophy, claiming to distinguish the revelation from the terms in which it is conveyed, in order to deny all authority in the terms.

St. Peter's expression, for instance, 2. i. 4, *Θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*, is pantheistic.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hampden 'appeals from the chaff to the wheat; from Paul philosophizing to Paul preaching, and 'entreating, and persuading.'<sup>2</sup> 'We must not take the words or 'propositions written by the inspired writers, as the substance 'of the revelation, but must look to the authenticated (?) dealings of God in the world.'<sup>3</sup> Even the *sacred words of our Lord himself* fare no better than those of the apostle's with this audacious speculator: 'In the instance of the woman thus suddenly cured, he is described as having perceived that some one 'had touched him, by the fact that *virtue* had gone out of Him—a mode of speaking characteristic of the prevalent idea concerning the operation of Divine influence, as of something 'passing from one body to another.'

So much for doctrines. In ordinances, too, Dr. Hampden's teaching is hardly to be distinguished from Dr. Arnold's. Dr. Hampden says, 'Theologians have not been content to rest on 'the simple fact of the Divine ordinance, appointing certain 'external rites as essential parts of Divine service on the part 'of man, available to the blessing of the receiver.'<sup>4</sup> Dr. Arnold: 'When Christians met together, and received the bread and 'wine of their common living, as the body and blood of Christ, 'such an act had a real tendency to strengthen and confirm 'their souls, and the Holy Spirit made such a communion a 'constant means of grace to those who partook of it.'<sup>5</sup> 'God's 'grace is conveyed by the sacraments, morally, because the 'joining Christ's Church, in the first instance, and the constantly 'refreshing our communion with it afterwards, are actions 'highly beneficial to our moral nature.'<sup>6</sup> Dr. Hampden: 'The 'faith of the receiver is the true consecrating principle.'<sup>7</sup> Dr. Arnold: 'The agreement of those communicating, their common faith and love, constitute the real consecration of the 'bread and wine.'

In respect of the authority of the Church, in her primitive, or universal teaching, Dr. Hampden holds, that 'it is only an

<sup>1</sup> Bampton Lectures, p. 197.

<sup>2</sup> Observations on Religious Dissent, p. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 312. <sup>4</sup> On the Church, p. 20.

<sup>5</sup> Bampton Lectures, p. 323.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 375.

<sup>7</sup> Bampton Lectures, p. 316.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>9</sup> On the Church, p. 21.



'*assumption* that universality and ubiquity are made the tests of religious doctrine. . . . Truth is rather the attribute of the few than of the many. . . . Who shall pronounce anything to be Divine truth, *simply because* it has the marks of having been *generally, or universally*, received among men?'<sup>1</sup> 'To me it matters little what opinion has been *prior*, has been advocated by the shrewdest wit or deepest learning, has been most popular, *most extensive in its reception*.'<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Arnold, holding the language of St. Ignatius 'exaggerated,' and 'more vehement than wise,' and considering it to have been 'most palpably abused by Cyprian,' nevertheless feels it 'satisfactory to find that the Church, in the very first century, had not grossly corrupted Christian truth.'<sup>3</sup> 'We are to seek for our knowledge of Christianity nowhere else but in the Scriptures; what *we find* there is a part of Christianity, whether recognised as such, or no, in after ages; what *we do not find* there is no part of Christianity, however early, or however general, may have been the attempts to interpolate it.'<sup>4</sup>

Thus, in both these writers is the whole structure of doctrine and sacraments, and the whole frame of Church authority in teaching, and succession in administering, annulled, and done away. Certain Divine facts, distinguishable from all words, even those of our Holy Lord and his Apostles themselves, are the entire matter of revelation; these, all who call themselves Christians may find, or not find, may understand, theorize about, interpret, as they please. There are, also, two external rites, which do men moral good when faithfully partaken in. Behold the framework of the Christian teaching of those who are, it appears, to be the model of our future Bishops—the men to fix, to all coming times, the character and doctrine of the English Church, given over, henceforth, as far as a Whig Prime Minister can give her, to Arnoldism, Bunsenism, and Hampdenism!

But, God be praised! the vitality of the Church in England rests not upon the propriety or impropriety of this or that appointment; nor, melancholy as is this recent attack upon her truth and liberty, has it failed to be followed by such a large, such a powerful and authoritative resistance and remonstrance, as must show to all the world, that her heart is yet in the right place, and that she still recognises and holds precious the divine verities of the Gospel. If only her sons and daughters are meek and faithful in their zeal; if they are not tempted, in

<sup>1</sup> Bampton Lectures, p. 356.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., pp. 95, 100, 122.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 149.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 47.

fretfulness and impatience, to take some hasty and schismatical step, mistaking a trial of the faith, and soundness of the Church, for a token of her being deserted of her Saviour ; if they avail themselves, in all humility and devotion, of the means of Divine grace, which she is the rich channel of imparting to them ; if they hold fast by her primitive service books, and shut their ears to this deluge of real infidelity, which is setting in from Germany ;—then we may hope that God will bring good out of our evil, and even by the very means of this reckless, insulting, and most lamentable appointment, pour out unexpected blessing on our suffering Church.

- ART. IV.—1. *The Life of Luther, written by himself, collected and arranged by M. MICHELET, Member of the Institute, Author of the History of France, &c. Translated by WILLIAM HAZLITT, Esq. of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.* London: David Bogue.
2. *Histoire de la Vie, des Ecrits, et des Doctrines de Martin Luther.* Par M. AUDIN, Membre des Académies Royales de Lyon, Turin, &c. Paris: L. Maisson.
3. *The Mission of the Comforter; and other Sermons, with Notes.* By JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A. Archdeacon of Lewes, Rector of Herstmonceux, and late Fellow of Trinity College. London: J. W. Parker. Cambridge: Macmillan.

THE life and character of Luther have been brought rather conspicuously before public attention of late years. The taste for the striking and powerful forms of character, which has been so general among us lately, pervading the most different schools of sentiment and doctrine, has contributed to this. The movement of opinion respecting the Reformation has also contributed. The special mixture of character which Luther exhibits, has kept alive the discussions about him, when once begun. He is peculiarly a man whom persons both like to attack and like to defend. To his advocates belongs the undoubted fact that he was a great man; to his opponents the very awkward question, whether he was a saint. He was very amiable; he was very virulent. He was frank and simple; he was crafty and double. He was not vain; he was self-willed and over-bearing. He liked power; he was indifferent to station. He had an ardent faith; he showed germs of rationalism. Few characters have exposed themselves more to the attacks of adversaries, or more engaged the sympathies of friends. His admirers are, indeed, fond of him,—fonder, perhaps, for the very fact that he has left himself so open to attack as he has. They think it an unfairness in fate to Luther, or in Luther to himself, for which they are bound in justice to compensate. Should he suffer for the temper which always made him show himself off to the worst? And should the fault, which his own frankness and carelessness about himself have put into our possession, not rather commend him the more to the generous judge?

Three biographies of Luther have appeared within the last few years; one by a friend, another by an enemy, and a third by a neutral. D'Aubigné's biography—for the first half of his History of the Reformation may be so called—has the

merit of a good deal of information, and a lively and pointed style, but is the thorough-going work of a partizan. The writer is always colouring, and will let nothing speak for itself. His comments do not occupy particular positions, and collect themselves into main groups, but are constant and ever recurring. The over quantity of detail in the narrative—a fault on its own account—is a worse fault as being so prolific of comment; for the smallest detail seldom wants its appendage. If the historian has no remark to make, the preacher has: and the reader, harassed with an endless reiteration of small reflections and officious instructions, retaliates, by regarding M. d'Aubigné as a writer a good deal more copious than weighty. His omissions in the line of fact are nearly as large, moreover, as his additions in the way of comment. He leaves out whole portions of Luther's character, or but faintly alludes to them. His aim is to assimilate Luther's ethical and religious mould as much as possible to that of an evangelical preacher of the present day. Luther does not gain by his biographer's tenderness on this head; and the same process which cuts off the irregularities, narrows the expanse, and tames the freedom of character.

M. Audin has, as might be expected, inserted a good many of the touches which M. d'Aubigné's pencil left out. Nor, though highly relishing his task, has he performed it ill-temperedly. His unfairness is not a malicious one; he delights in the amiable tasks of the favourist, and extols all his friends with innocent audacity, the notorious Tetzels among the rest: but he is not harsh and vituperative to opponents. He only gives, however, the more active and fiery parts of the Reformer's character, and not the whole of it; and describes Luther's external career better than Luther himself.

M. Michelet's *Life* hardly professes to be more than a crude and straggling performance: its composition having been the amusement of the writer during an illness. It consists, principally, of passages strung together from the table-talk, and those parts of Luther's writings where the Reformer speaks of himself. M. Michelet stands idly by, and gives the reader no assistance. An admiration of Luther's greatness, sympathy with his genial flow of spirits, and amusement at his faults and extravagances, compose, as far as we can see, the feeling of the impartial biographer toward his hero: and the sceptic seems to gaze with quiet pleasure upon the medley which the religious leader, saint, and prophet of so many millions of Christians exhibits.

The mode in which Luther is introduced to our notice, in the pages of national history, creates an impression of him as

primarily a practical, rather than a doctrinal reformer. He comes before us suddenly as the opponent of some great practical abuses in the Church: we connect him, in the first instance, with the resistance to indulgences. We thus picture a doctrinal movement, as arising, in process of time, out of a practical one; and Luther appears one of those rough, energetic minds which, only alive at first to the palpable and tangible, gradually advance to the department of opinion and belief. This is undoubtedly true of the multitudes whom Luther moved. They were moved, in the first instance, by the gross practical abuses in the Church; and those supplied that groundwork to the reforming movement, without which it could not have advanced at all. But it is not true of Luther. If there are two classes of influential men in the world, great practical men and men who propagate ideas, Luther belonged, in the first instance, to the latter. His mind was full of an idea, and he wished to propagate it. National history brings us across him for the first time engaged in a particular practical movement; but his biography shows that the doctrinal was then already begun and in progress.

The process by which leading ideas are arrived at is generally that of doubt and perplexity. A particular class of minds feels strongly the difficulties which surround the whole subject of morality and religion. Some have one difficulty, and some another. They dwell upon the obstacles to their internal peace with an intensity natural, or morbid, as may be: and, after they have brooded long enough, they hit on a solution. This solution is then the idea which occupies and fills their minds. They have felt a want, and they have relieved it; they have put their question, and had their answer: they have been in suspense, and now are settled. They prize the new conviction, because it succeeds to so much indefiniteness and void. The search has enhanced the discovery, the toil the reward; and the offspring of mental troubles is loved as an only child. The idea which has destroyed a difficulty is a victorious champion on which the mind reposes ever after, and to which it refers all of system, adjustment, and completeness it has attained to.

Luther had a natural character, which made him strongly alive to difficulties; that is to say, a character which partook largely of melancholy. Dante, Cromwell, Dr. Johnson, Cowper, Rousseau, Lord Byron, Shelley, are instances of men, who in their different ways, high or low, religious or sceptical, uncouth or refined, were melancholy men. Luther was one of this class of men. He had a mind intently self-contemplative, and profoundly unquiet, which, except the strongest active occupations diverted it, preyed upon itself; scrutinized its own faith,

feelings, fears and hopes; pried into the mysteries of its own nature; and provoked internal dissatisfactions and struggles. Luther speaks of his great scenes of trial as being throughout life internal. His agonies, his temptations, his colloquies with himself or with Satan, the tenderest controversy and the most formidable disputant, were always within him. He had just that disposition on which particular difficulties, and the ideas which seem to solve them, lay remarkable hold.

The opening circumstances of Luther's life were not calculated to discourage or tame such a disposition. The calm of a restless spirit is activity; and quiet unsettles and agitates it. The retirement and dulness of the Augustin monastery at Wittenburgh, threw him the more upon himself and his own thoughts. The particular circumstances of his entrance into monastic life were also trying. A stroke of lightning which killed his bosom friend by his side, according to some writers, though others make the thunderstorm and the death of Alexis two different events, inspired him with sudden terror. A lively, joyous temperament was also most alive to calls; and possessed a power of forming sudden strong resolutions. He was able, in a moment, to change the prospects of a life; a vow uttered on the spot, dedicated him to monasticism; and the accomplished, philosophical, literary academician, the favourite of fellow-students who enjoyed his humour, and of scientific professors who predicted his greatness, called his friends together, enjoyed an evening of brilliant conversation and music, and the next morning knocked at the gate of the Augustin monastery, which closed after him. But the young devotee was not made a monk by the change. The constant interruptions to formal prayer were irksome to him: he did not stomach the household monastic tasks he was set to; tasks, indeed, needlessly humiliating and offensive, and, if intended to correct the fastidiousness of his previous education, arguing a blundering, however well-meaning discipline, in the monastery. Luther felt himself, in addition to the ordinary confinements and privations of a monastic life, to be among inferior and unsympathizing minds, alone, suspected, and ill-used.

There was another and more direct cause which led to religious melancholy and difficulties. Luther had ardent aspirations after the perfect and saintly character. There is not the smallest reason for doubting not only his sincerity, but his strength of will, and readiness to endure the greatest self-denial and mortification in pursuit of that character. But, impatient of regular discipline and routine, the more simple and external motive of obedience, for leading a holy life, was supplied in his case by a motive of another stamp. He had, what has been



a frequent feature, though never a very sound one, in religionists, an active, not to say fidgety, desire for a state of conscious and palpable peace of mind. He was ambitious of inward satisfaction, the sensation of spiritual completeness. His devotion was based upon a direct aim at this result. He pursued it vehemently by ascetic means. He fasted, prayed, watched long and rigorously. 'Often on returning to his cell he knelt at the foot of the bed, and remained there until day-break.' His asceticism, mingling with the internal fever and tumult of his mind, gave him an unnatural strength; and he relates that 'once for a whole fortnight, he neither ate, drank, or slept.' His health gave way before such severities: from being fresh and plump, he became pale and emaciated, and was brought almost to death's door. One little fact shows the remarkable union of great irregularity in religion, with a morbid aim at perfectness. He would omit his daily breviary prayers for long periods: then, when his conscience smote him, he would make good the default with literal exactness, and scrupulously go through, in one continuous act, the precise amount of devotions he had omitted. That is to say, he was not satisfied with the feeling of having done something to atone for his fault: he wanted the feeling of having annihilated the fault itself, and put himself exactly into his original state as he stood before it was committed. In this way Luther went on, seeking with all the eagerness of direct effort an absolutely clear conscience. The pursuit, of course, did not succeed. A clear conscience was always farther off the farther he pursued it; and at the close of each stage of his devotional course, he was as discontented with himself as when he began. 'At the foot of the altar, his hands clasped, his eyes full of tears,' he prayed for peace, and found none. 'One morning the door of his cell not being open as usual, the brethren became alarmed; they knocked, and there was no reply. The door was burst in, and Fra Martin was found stretched on the ground, in a state of ecstasy, scarcely breathing, and well-nigh dead.' At the sight of the Holy Sacrament borne in a procession, 'he perspired at every pore, and thought he should die of fear.' Vexed, wearied, harassed, and faint, his mind fell a prey to a formidable difficulty to which its labours and aspirations had introduced it.

There is one apparent grievance attaching to our moral nature, which all who cultivate that nature with any degree of strictness must in a degree experience. It is connected with the operations of conscience. However we might be led beforehand, by considerations of the general nature of moral goodness, to expect that goodness would produce internal satisfaction and self-approval, we find that as a matter of experience, it fails to

produce this. Conscience does not allow of such sensations. Good acts leave the soul as they found it, uneasy and discontented with itself, and under a sense of sin, even as regards the performance of those very acts themselves. Within the world of experience good acts disappoint. They do not accomplish their natural end, and fulfil their essential promise. Moral beings yearn for self-approval: they feel the absence of it as a void and a pain: they are told to act virtuously, and that they will have it; but they do act virtuously, and self-approval does not come. Virtue seems to stand them in no stead, and do them no service here: they might as well be vicious. The greatest sinner, the greatest saint, are equidistant from the goal where the mind rests in satisfaction with itself. All approach to that point labours under some inherent contradiction: all progress is a stand-still; all impetus and determination spend themselves with the circles of a mathematical necessity: the eager will shoots forward, but the laws of the moral world are firm, and unseen impossibility makes its appearance in results. The defect is not one resulting from the degree of their virtue: no tendency in the universal quality to meet the craving for such self-approval appears. The tendency is the other way, and with the growth in goodness grows the sense of sin. One law fulfilled, shows a thousand neglected; and virtue, as it really advances, recedes more and more, in our own contemplation of it, into the position of one weak and poor particle, struggling amid a mass of evil in the character. Moral advancement, as a natural consequence, destroys the sense of merit, and produces that of sin; and thus, as a natural consequence, it seems to defeat itself.

This unkindly effect of goodness, moreover, if it is such, is not kept out of sight in Scripture, but put prominently forward, and suggested to us. For real goodness is in many passages there actually and in the most marked way *tested*, by its producing just the contradictory impression to that of goodness, in the individual's own conscience. Indeed, so determinately is this contradictory consequence attached to, and made the natural consequence of, the state of goodness; that by a strong figure of speech the holy text sometimes puts the consequence of the state for the state itself, and speaks of righteousness as if it were sin; just as it, on the other hand, speaks of sin as it were righteousness. And a whole line of expression meets us from which one would at first sight suppose, that sinners were actual favourites of God as such; and that, on the contrary, the righteous were not at all pleasing to Him. There is a coldness in the remarks about the righteous, as if God were angry with them because, persisting in their original integrity, they did not

give Him the opportunity of exercising his sovereign free grace and pity toward them: sinners, on the other hand, are dearly loved, because they give Him this opportunity; they have His affections, on the principle which prevails in the sphere of ordinary human feeling, that 'pity is akin to love;' whereas those who are independent of us, and ask nothing from us, we do not care for. 'They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.' 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.' 'There is joy in the presence of the angels of God, over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance.' 'Her sins which are many are forgiven her, for she loveth much: but to whom little is forgiven the same loveth little.' Thus the parable of the lost sheep; the parable of the lost piece of money; the parable of the lost son. All these parables create at first sight the impression of it being an actual advantage to be lost and to be a sinner, something to be coveted and sought after with all our might. The reader naturally immediately thinks that he had much rather be the sheep that was lost than one of those that had never gone astray; and had much rather be the son who had wandered, and was greeted on his return with such an overflow of affection, than the son who had never wandered, and had no such greeting. Now it, of course, is absurd to suppose that actual sin is pleasing to God, actual righteousness not pleasing to him; indeed, we know from the context that the 'righteous' to whom Our Lord alludes, were actually the most wicked of mankind, viz. the Pharisees who crucified Him,—men who could only be righteous in the sense of being righteous in their own eyes. The feeling of being sinful and the feeling of being righteous, then, are, under the expressions sin and righteousness, the real things which God respectively praises and blames. Still the language is very remarkable, as fixing in such a direct and summary way this contradictory effect upon goodness. In the Gospel self-approval appears as something signally unfit for the creature; enormous, abominable, and *contra Deum*. It appears as the mark of the beast, the sign, where it exists, that the soul has departed from God, and relapsed into its own vile, dead, and selfish nature. There is a happiness, indeed, which belongs to conscious merit, soberly expecting its reward in the course of nature, of which the whole-day's labourer waiting for his wages is the exemplar; and uninstructed reason fixes on that as the happiness of the saint. But the Gospel, in describing the joy of the rewarded saint, has recourse to a very different type. It refers us to those indescribable emotions which seize the mind upon any sudden rescue from evil, which it has no right to expect. The parables of the lost piece of

money, and the lost sheep, and the lost son, all appeal to this type of joy; and intimate the great superiority of the pleasures of this type to those of the former, as having, from the very nature of the case, so much more liveliness and depth in them; the sensations of possession and safety necessarily having an acme and intensity after loss and danger which they could not have had before. For the reward of goodness, then, the Gospel gives us a pleasure of this type; that is to say, it gives not the peace of self-approval but the joy of pardon: the most accepted man has, by some mystery, most sins forgiven, and his happiness lies in that forgiveness. Philosophy of old dreamed, indeed, of the happiness of conscious virtue; and the 'memory of a well-spent life' filled its disciples with serene thoughts, and bade them look for the rewards of self-discipline in the act of self-contemplation. The wise man looked within himself and was satisfied; the world without was wild, but he was tranquil, balanced, and perfect. He had always a retrospect which consoled, and a conscience which supported him. He had done well, and was recompensed; he had worked, and he had his wages; and he received his reward with the dignity and self-possession which belongs to one who enjoys a right. Self-approval was the *præmium virtutis* of ancient philosophy. Most natural ambition. But how roughly did Christianity break these morning slumbers of the wise and good! 'Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee life.' The dream was dispelled, and man awoke to real life and facts; he was shown himself, and saw what he had never seen before—a feeble will, effort always short, struggle ending in self-contempt, and virtue never got, but always to be attained. The mystery of conscience was revealed; and he discovered that he had done nothing, had secured no standing ground. From the yawning pit he reached forth a hand as he was sinking; it was caught, and he was saved. Then followed a pleasure, in comparison with which all that his philosophy had offered him was nothing—the pleasure of rescue. The Gospel destroyed one set of satisfactions, but replaced them with a higher. For the calmness and repose of self-approval, there was the intense, quick, miraculous delight of pardon; for human satisfaction there was superhuman, and for the order of nature the mystery of grace.

The inevitable tendency of human goodness, then, being to produce the sense of sin, it is to be remarked next, that such sense of sin is not the same with the common ordinary feeling so called, that is, with remorse and a bad conscience. A good action produces a sense of sin indeed, and a bad action does; but it would be absurd to say, that the feeling in the mind

after performing a good action, was exactly the same with the feeling after performing a bad one. In the one case the conscience is displeased with the action as simply bad; in the other case it is displeased with it because it falls short of absolute good. That sense of sin which grows with advance in goodness is less properly the sense of sin than the sense of imperfection. The sense of imperfection is a feeling quite strong enough for the occasion, quite sufficient, that is, to explain and account for the class of painful and humiliating sensations which have to be accounted for; for imperfection is *quasi* sin, and affects the mind in a way somewhat similar and cognate to that in which actual sin does. The sense of it is galling, painful, humiliating, just as the sense of sin is. Let any one examine, by a reference to his own feelings and experience, what the peculiar effect of imperfection upon the mind is. Its effect is to spoil anything done as an object of regard and contemplation. Nor is this the case in morals only, but in art, science, literature. It is so much the constitution of the human mind to seek finish and completeness, that any falling short of that is a disappointment which it cannot get over. The end is the test of true being; and things only really are, when they are finished, are perfect. The work which falls short of that point is only an embryo of a work: and, the vertex of perfection once conceived in the mind, all below is confused, chaotic, formless. Take any artistic creation of our minds—a book, a drawing, a building, a mechanical contrivance—we were absolutely pleased with it so long as we thought it perfect, that is to say, so long as we did not realize any definite falling short in it. But let a definite falling short be once seen, and let us once have in our mind a clear image of the work more perfect than we have made it, and that complacency goes. As an object of contemplation our work is marred, it offends us, and we eject it from our thoughts, and think no more of it than we can help. We betake ourselves to the future indeed, and to that hope which happily no experience can ever defeat, that the next thing we do will be satisfactory; but the thing done is defaced, the past is taken from us. Such is the law of a nature which aspires to perfection. The point rises higher and higher, throwing disaster and defeat upon all below it. It is the same in morals: an action is in morals what a work of art, or a composition, is in art and literature. Take any action, or course of action, however conscientious, nay, heroic; it ceases to be an object of satisfactory contemplation as soon as ever the mind realizes a definite better, which it could and ought to have been. Thus, suppose an extraordinary act in one of the religious departments of prayer, fasting, or charity. An ascetic

worshipper stays on his knees for hours; he stays till his mind is painfully wearied and exhausted. But free will is strong, and could keep him there longer if he exerted it sufficiently. Nevertheless the desire for relief prevails, and he rises, either to recreate or to rest himself. Now certainly he has performed a religious act of some difficulty, and might so far feel self-approval; but then arises the uncomfortable consciousness that he has wilfully curtailed it. The act immediately loses its wholeness, and the wilful stopping short is more annoying than the advance up to that point is satisfactory. The sin of not having done more, spoils the goodness of having done so much; indulged frailty and infirmity vex and occupy the conscience, and the consequence is, that he has more of the feeling of sin than if he had never done the act to begin with. It would be the same in any other religious department. Imagine this sense of imperfection deepening and enlarging, eating into the core of every good act, and spoiling and defacing in proportion to the extent of that material which virtuous effort supplies it to deface; and we have before us the progress of that peculiar sense of sin which grows with the advance in goodness.

Imperfection, then, being the cause of that sense of sin which accompanies good works, the view which we take of such good works, in consequence of such sinfulness attaching to them, depends on the view we take of imperfection. Now there is one view of imperfection, which, fully recognising the faultiness and defectiveness which must attach to every imperfect production as such, and even allowing the rigid definition of true existence to be perfection, still leaves an imperfect production a *something*, and does not wholly annihilate it. With respect to the subject before us, such a view refuses to pronounce of the goodness of man's works, that, because it is imperfect, it is therefore no goodness at all, and to deprive it of all cognizableness. According to it, there are in the constitution of things approaches and tendencies as well as completions. These works are not nothing, because they are not at all; nor because they are infinitely distant from infinite goodness are they reduced to an equality with absolute stationariness. Space is infinite, and yet there is a difference between a yard and a mile. Time is infinite, and yet an hour is longer than a minute. On a line which travels from a given goal into infinity one may proceed no way at all, another a short way, another a longer way. The merest reaching forward of the human soul toward goodness is a moral something; approaches are cognizable, measurable, appreciable things. In the confessed absence of the absolute attribute, an inferior and subordinate goodness is thus saved for human works, and something of, or belonging to, the nature of goodness is left in them. And



this view of imperfection is the one which the conscience itself takes. That displeasure at defect and shortcoming, however real and however disturbing, which grows with advance in goodness, is not after all unaccompanied with another and a pleasing kind of consciousness. Though it is a part of truth to call conscience insatiable and self-condemning, it is not the whole of it. If it condemns on one side, it justifies on another. It censures and it commends in one and the same act of reflection. The human soul is such a marvellous, many-sided, and intricate creation, that no one line of observation can do it justice or represent it fairly. Peace and disappointment mingle, and tempered oppositions compose the soul's, as they do the body's, health. Rising satisfaction feels the drawback; and, on the other hand, even in the lowest abasements and self-condemnations of a true saint, there is a latent confidence arising out of his own works. If conscience accuses too harshly, conscience itself is judged for doing so, and a higher conscience steps in. 'If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart.'—'Yea, I judge not mine own self.' Though conscience will not let us feed on its satisfactions, it gives us a taste of them, and allows something which is, and is not, self-approval. Thus, it is absurd to say that a good life is to produce no consolatory and joyful reflections whatever in the retrospect. 'I have fought a good fight,' says St. Paul; 'I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness.' The same Scripture which so sternly rebukes a proud self-approval, directs us, nevertheless, to a certain state of mind which it calls a 'conscience void of offence,' and allows the true-hearted and honest soul, amid the reproach of an ungodly world, to vindicate itself, and find consolation in the consciousness of its own truth and integrity. 'I have not dwelt with vain persons, neither have I had fellowship with the deceitful.' 'I have loved the habitation of thine house.' 'I have had as great delight in the way of thy testimonies as in all manner of riches.' 'O turn from me shame and rebuke, for I have kept thy testimonies.' 'I have chosen the way of truth, and thy judgments have I laid before me.' 'Thy statutes have been my songs.' 'I am wiser than the aged, because I keep thy commandments.'

But Luther had thrown himself into a temper of mind which was not favourable to taking such a *via media* in the estimation of good works. A too ambitious and direct pursuit of spiritual satisfaction,—a too great longing for the palpable and the apprehensible in religion, had over-stimulated and unbalanced him. A morbid eagerness for some extreme and perfect state of self-approval and conscious elevation, and an irregular and headstrong asceticism pursued for its attainment, presented him

unprepared for meeting disappointment; and the result was, that when that disappointment came, as it infallibly must come sooner or later, and when, after an excited pursuit, the impossibility of the object at last broke upon him, and he found that self-approval ever fled, and perfection never came, he felt the vehement impulse immediately of a disappointed man to insist on the very contrary extreme. To an impetuous nature the favourite alternative is all or none: the work half done annoys, and there is a pleasure in effacing it altogether. As Luther could not find a wholly approving conscience, he would have a simply condemning one; and as good works could not be perfect, he would not have them to be good works at all. A rigid definition of goodness, as perfect goodness, annihilated at one stroke all goodness below that point, because it was below it; converting it, as if in revenge, into absolute evil. That sense of sin which obedience created, and which increased in proportion to obedience, was in Luther's retaliatory disgust confounded with sin itself; and the law, in theological language, made productive of sin only.

Such was the conclusion to which Luther came; its first effect was to make him turn round with fierceness and hostility upon the whole system of things which maintained such a balk, to a degree that the character of the Deity himself seemed at stake with him. '*Ego ipse offendebar,*' are his words, '*ut optarem nunquam me esse creatum hominem.*' 'I was indignant, and gave silent utterance to murmuring, if not altogether to blasphemy. I said to myself, Is it not, then, enough that wretched sinners, already damned for original sin, should be overwhelmed with so many miseries by the decrees of the Decalogue, but God must add further misery to misery by his Gospel, menacing us even there with his justice and anger?' He addressed God in the language of offended Job: 'Thou art my enemy without cause.' 'Jerome, and other fathers, had trials—those of the flesh; Augustin and Ambrose had trials—those of the persecuting sword; but mine were far worse, they came from the angel of Satan, who strikes with the fist.' There is nothing vituperative or disparaging of Luther, in saying that he had, in his intellectual nature, suppressed, indeed, by a powerful though irregular faith, an element of that sensitive and rebellious temperament which has made men before now atheists. Lucretius saw a great difficulty in the unsatisfying nature of religion, *i.e.* conscience, which he accused of filling the mind with horror and self-condemnation, instead of peace:—

'Quæ caput a cœli regionibus ostendebat  
Horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans.'

He thought this must be wrong, and therefore denied the truth of religion altogether. Shelley's atheism was connected with difficulties in the same department: his whole nature rebelled against what appeared to him to be the issue of the moral process in the human soul:—

'And who made terror, madness, crime, remorse,  
Which from the links of the great chain of things,  
To every thought within the mind of man  
Sway and drag heavily, and each one reels  
Under the load towards the pit of death;  
Abandoned hope, and love that turns to hate,  
*And self-contempt, bitterer to drink than blood.*'

The more simple portion of mankind see difficulties only as facts, and not as difficulties; every stoppage is only their natural resting-place, their minds exactly fit in with facts, and feel no pressure. But others cannot see a difficulty without seeing its bearing; a subtle thread connects it immediately with their central faith, the responsibility is thrown back upon the foundation, and the whole system to which it attaches feels the challenge. All the world sees the existence of evil, but there is every shade of perception of it as a difficulty, from that temper of mind which does not see it as a difficulty at all, to that with whom it shakes the very throne of God Himself. Luther, who now saw a difficulty of nature in the artificial and exaggerated strength which a theory of his own had given it, felt the effect of his own work; and that state of absolute evil in man which a gratuitously rigid definition of goodness had imposed, agitated and puzzled him. He pictured miserable man vainly fighting with a stern and inexorable impossibility, which excluded him from ever attaining that chief good to the pursuit of which his nature impelled him; and the whole construction of the human soul, which imposed toil and agony and rewarded with self-contempt, was a scandal. The insatiableness of the law, the law of conscience, was a grievance in the constitution of things: 'The more you try to fulfil it, the more you will transgress it.' 'You accumulate law upon law, and all issues but in miserable self-torture and pain. *Una lex gignit alias decem*—one law begets ten more, till they mount up to infinity.' 'The stone of Sisyphus ever rolls, the vessel of the Danaïdes never fills.' With a Manichæan intensity he insisted upon the absolute evil of all visible and perceptible nature. The sun was darkness, and the moon refused to give her light, and the stars of heaven were extinguished. 'In man and in the devil spiritual things were extinct.' A fierce hatred of the world rose up, of this whole visible system of things, as so much pure evil—'a world of dread and ruin, of sin, and anger, and judgment, where is

'nothing celestial, nothing divine; which is nothing else but the kingdom of the devil, a flood of death, hell, sin, and all evils, oppressing quaking, miserable man.' 'Do what thou wilt, *tu es in hoc seculo nequam*, thou art in this wicked world; this world which is darkness, not is *in* darkness, but *is* darkness itself.' Luther's language, after he had arrived at his explanation of this evil, shows how it must have worked upon him before. Throughout his writings there come up continually traces of a state of mind which had seen something really wrong, and to be complained of, in the constitution of things; and his forms of expression edge with a venturesome nicety upon, without actually touching, the justice of the Deity. In his book, *De Seruo Arbitrio*, a fatalist line of thought brings him into contact with this awful subject, and he describes the Deity as 'though not making sin,' yet, as if it were the next thing to it, 'not ceasing to make and multiply natures vitiated by sin, natures from which He has withdrawn His Spirit.' The expression has the effect of bringing the Divine mind into some kind of vicinity to the production of evil, and throwing a responsibility upon it on that head: as if, though God did not create the principle of evil in the first instance, he voluntarily concreted it, and gave it that teeming and multitudinous life which it has in the existence of innumerable individual evil beings. Nor does Luther disguise the peculiar trial to his faith which this department of speculation brings: '*hic fidei summus gradus credere justum qui sua voluntate nos necessario damnabiles facit.*'

Such passionate and semi-sceptical thoughts cleared away, but only to leave Luther confronting, in their place, a most grave difficulty of Christian doctrine; for, upon the dogma of the absolute evil of man's goodness, a great difficulty immediately arises with respect to the doctrine of justification. How was man ever to be justified, and become acceptable to God, being, as he was, simply evil? The fundamental teaching of natural religion is, that man must recommend himself to God by some or other goodness, *bonâ fide* belonging to him: indeed, such a truth is no more than a mode of stating what natural religion is. The fundamental teaching of the Church Catholic has been the same: that is to say, the Church has always admitted good works into a regular place in the process of man's justification. But the Church has been enabled to do this from the circumstance that she has never annihilated the goodness of human works on account of their imperfection. She has all

<sup>1</sup> 'Licet enim Deus peccatum non faciat, tamen naturam peccato, subtracto Spiritu, vitiatam, non cessat formare et multiplicare, tanquam si Faber ex ligno corrupto status faciat. Ita qualis est natura, tales fiunt homines, Deo creante et formante illos ex natura tali.'—*De Seruo Arb.*, Op. vol. ii. p. 459.

along taken a practical, common-sense ground on this subject, and has not allowed experimental disappointments of conscience, or speculative difficulties respecting infinity and perfection, to depreciate good works in her eyes. She has never been extreme and exigent, or let her divines insist on some impossible perfection, in order that they may reduce all actions beneath it to a level. She has been ever moderate, gentle, and discreet, making allowances, and admitting approximations. The Church has therefore been enabled to maintain, with respect to man's justification, all the teaching of natural religion, and the whole language of reason; such as, that all who do their duty according to their light please God in their degree; that the least effort, be it only sincere, is acceptable; that all which, upon fair consideration, we pronounce to be good, or to partake of goodness, or to have something or other to do with goodness, in human conduct, all which is morally pleasing and commendable, is in its measure pleasing to God, and tends to make the doer pleasing to Him. But Luther annihilated all goodness in the first instance because it was imperfect;—he was, therefore, deprived of goodness as the means of justification; and therefore he had the difficulty to solve, how man could be justified at all.

Such was the climax of a long series of mental perplexities and troubles. One great absorbing difficulty brought them to a head—a human soul which was absolutely evil, and which could not, therefore, according to any existing method, be justified.

His difficulty now in clear and definite shape before him, Luther had to find a solution for it. He found one in the doctrine of Imputation. To compensate for his total denial of actual goodness in man, he threw himself upon the idea of an imputed goodness; intensifying and pushing out the imputed exactly to the amount which his denial of the actual required. The act of imputation, considered in the abstract, is of an extreme, simple, and arbitrary character, depending wholly on the imputer, and not at all on the person imputed to, and conferring the imputed thing or quality wholly irrespectively of conditions. As received and entertained, however, in the Church at large, this idea of imputation comes before us qualified by the conditions which natural religion imposes; and as natural religion does not allow of the notion that perfect righteousness can be imputed by God to men who have done nothing whatever but evil, the imputation which the Church teaches becomes necessarily a conditional act, dependent on the character of the person to whom the imputation is made. But Luther insisted on giving imputation the whole unqualified

force of the abstract idea; that is to say, he pushed it out to the extent of its being absolute, and irrespective of the character of the person the subject of it. The one idea of imputation thus entirely met the difficulty which he had to meet; for, whereas his difficulty was that man had no goodness by means of which to be justified, here was a method of justification which required no goodness whatever in him. Here was the principle pronounced—and it was quite a new one in the Christian world—that the goodness of the person had nothing whatever to do with his being accounted good by God. Here was the moral quality or character in man altogether separated from his justification, declared to be alien and irrelevant, null and void with reference to it. ‘The law was abolished, the whole law, moral ‘as well as ceremonial,’ and had no place or existence in the scheme of reconciliation. Luther had answered his question, how man was to be justified; and the difficulty of absolute evil on man’s part had a complete and triumphant solution in the doctrine of absolute imputation on God’s.

We have stated the fundamental point in Luther’s system; but, in order to have a fuller idea of it, it will be proper to go a little farther, and see it in its working.

The righteousness of man, then, being a simply *imputed* one, in contrast with an *actual* state of absolute sin, the next step in the Lutheran system was to say that man individually appropriated that righteousness to himself, or was individually justified, when the idea of that imputed righteousness wholly expelled and effaced the sense of that actual sin. To achieve this transmutation was the triumph of Christianity in Luther’s view, and he dwells and enlarges on it with untiring enthusiasm. On the one side indeed, was the world actual and cognizable declared to be wholly evil: human nature with its moral affections, tastes, and power of will, was so much mere flesh, the flesh which the Gnostic hated and anathematized; evil, rotten, and hostile to God. The very construction of human nature was against attaining goodness; goodness being always the further off the more it was pursued. Evil was evil, and issued such; and man ‘was under the elements of this world,’ and could not escape from its bondage. Such was the world actual and cognizable according to Luther. But his next step is, to tell us that with that world we have nothing to do; that all this evil is absolutely irrelevant, and that the perfect righteousness of Christ is, by imputation, our real state and condition all the time. This righteousness was indeed wholly external to us, wholly removed from our nature, conscience, life, and being; was in no sense an attribute of ourselves: we looked within and did not see it; our spiritual perception itself did not see it:



it did not appear; it was nowhere. Still it was ours: we had it: we were perfectly righteous with the perfect righteousness of Christ. *Intra conscientiam Diabolus: extra conscientiam Deus.* Luther insists particularly on the fact of this total separation between our life and consciousness and this righteousness, and also upon the total irrelevancy of that fact. 'Thou, brother, wishest to have visible righteousness; that is, thou wishest to feel righteousness, as thou feelest sin: this cannot be. Thy justice must transcend the sense of sin: and make thee believe that thou art righteous in God's sight. Thy justice is not visible, is not sensible, but to be revealed in its own time. Thou must not judge, then, according to the sense of sin, which terrifies and disturbs thee; but according to the promise of faith whereby Christ is promised to thee; who is thy perfect and eternal righteousness.'—'Thou sayest, I do not perceive that I have righteousness; thou must not perceive, but believe that thou hast righteousness.' With tremendous energy he inculcates unceasingly this doctrine; that, as far as any moral existence, *i. e.* any moral evidences of existence in our hearts and minds, are concerned, we are not to think of them, with reference to this righteousness; that it has nothing to do with our moral nature, but that it does exist truly and absolutely nevertheless, and is our own. This is the great truth upon which we are to live. The believer has to think himself to be perfectly righteous, though he sees himself to be perfectly wicked. And this explains a phraseology to which we come in Luther's writings, and which at first considerably perplexes us. For after all this picture of the unmixed evil and sin with which our conscience is ever upbraiding us, Luther is often, and earnestly, impressing upon us this particular distinction with respect to sin;—that, though it must be felt somehow and by some part of us, the *conscience* must not feel it. Of all our faculties, the conscience specially is restricted from feeling sin. Now such a phraseology is incomprehensible at first; for it is something like telling us that objects must be seen, but that of all the organs and senses of our nature, the eye must not see them; or that sounds must be heard, but that of all our senses and perceptions, the ear must not hear them. Conscience is that faculty of which the particular function is to distinguish right and wrong, and convict us of sin if we have committed sin; and therefore if sin is felt at all, conscience must be the part which feels it. Upon examination, however, we see that this is only a strong form of speech for expressing the fact that the consciousness of internal sin must be absorbed and extinguished in the higher conviction of external righteousness. To express this, the conscience is described as itself becoming changed into this higher conviction: its nature inverted, it

is imperatively required to be conscious of that of which it is not conscious, and not conscious of that of which it is conscious. Sin must not reign in the conscience, but be content with torturing the body; that is to say, the body which cannot feel it may feel it; the conscience which can must not. The language is equivalent to saying that sin may be perceived as a fact, but not as sin: it is the peculiar function of conscience to perceive it as sin, therefore conscience must not be allowed to entertain the perception of it at all: but a certain lower perception in our nature can see it as a fact, without being in the least troubled at it; and within the sphere of such perceptions it may be allowed to come. With the memento that man's righteousness, as being sin, and the law as producing sin, have the same unfitness with sin, to be objects of conscience; such appears to be the key to a large body of language we encounter in Luther. 'Conscience has nothing to do with the law, with works, or with human righteousness.' 'The law must remain *extra cœlum*, i.e. *extra cor et conscientiam*.' 'Suffer the law to reign over thy body, not over thy conscience.' 'The law hath dominion over the flesh; but if it wishes to occupy the conscience,' &c.—'The flesh should be subject to the law, remain in its sepulchre, and be vexed by the Egyptians; but the conscience must be free.' 'In the state let the severest obedience to the law be exacted:—i. e. because the state does not recognise sin as sin, but only as injurious to society, therefore the state may be alive to sin—but not the conscience. 'Let the conscience sleep joyfully in Christ, without the least sense of the law of sin and death.'—'When thy conscience is terrified with the law, and struggles with the judgment of God, then consult neither the law nor reason, but depend on grace alone, and the word of consolation. Then conduct thyself altogether as though thou hadst never heard of the law of God: ascend into the darkness, where is the light neither of law nor reason, but the enigma of faith only, which certainly decrees that thou art saved in Christ, beyond and outside of the law. Beyond and above the light of law and reason doth the Gospel take us, into the darkness of faith where the law and reason have no business.' 'Where there is fear and the sense of sin, death, wrath, and judgment; there there is nothing celestial, nothing divine.'—'But drown thy conscience in the wounds, blood, death, and resurrection of Christ.' 'Let the pious remember that in conscience they are free before God, from the curse of the law, though they are slaves to the law in the body.' The Old Testament is allegorized on this principle; and the conscience ascends with Isaac to the mount, the burden of the law remains with the ass below: conscience ascends with Moses, the law descends with

him to be dispensed to the people below. 'Moses on the mount, when he speaks face to face with God, hath not, makes not, administers not, the law. But, having come down from the mountain he is a legislator, and governs the people with the law. In like manner let thy conscience be free from the law, but let thy body be subject to the law.' 'Let Moses remain on the earth, there let him be a doctor of the letter, an exacter of the law, a crucifier of sinners;—but for us, we have a new guest and a new house; Christ has come, and Moses, the old occupier, must depart and migrate elsewhere.' The meaning is under every form and turn of language, and there is not much variety even in that, exactly the same. Our conscience must be conscious alone of that which it does not see in us—righteousness; totally unconscious of that which it alone does see in us—sin.

Such are the two Lutheran worlds, or natures, of utter evil and absolute good; a perceptible and actual state of evil, an unperceived and imputed state of good; whereof the latter must wholly annihilate in idea and feeling the former, in order for the individual to be justified. The 'Law,' and 'Christ,' for these are respectively their two names, are antagonist principles opposed to each other with the intensity and fierceness of the two principles in the Eastern Dualistic philosophies;—'two contraries in irreconcilable war with each other;' and the triumph is when the former is destroyed. The 'Law' is horror, blackness, quaking, pallor, sadness, and despair; a 'dungeon,' a 'hell,' a 'sepulchre,' a 'torturer,' a 'butcher:' 'whoever saith he loves it, lies: that robber who loves his own 'dungeon, raves.' To this legislatorial principle 'Christ' is the antagonistic. '*Christus gigas potentissimus sustulit legem.*' Christ does not legislate, but kills law. He says to the 'Law,' *Ego ligabo te*, I will bind thee: Captivity, I will lead thee captive; Satan, I am thy Satan; I am the 'Butcher of the butcher,' and the 'Devil to the devil.'

And now we come to the power by which the believer was enabled to attain this victory, and wholly supplant this sin by this righteousness; that is to say, to the medium in the process of individual justification. Though all moral conditions were rejected, some medium or other it was necessary to have by which an evil nature was to lay hold of, and appropriate to itself, a perfect righteousness; as it could not be supposed that an evil being would become absolutely good in God's sight, without anything at all done on his side. The medium then laid down for this purpose was Faith. But it was faith of a particular character, which, in connexion with the system, should be noticed.

Faith, then, before it was allowed to occupy its position in the Lutheran process of justification, was carefully divested of all moral characteristics. There is a faith, which is in its very nature, akin to love or moral: but it was not this kind of faith which Luther made the medium between man and God in the act of justification. To have allowed any moral element in this medium, would have been to allow human goodness a place in the act of justification, which it was its first principle to avoid: and, therefore, he jealously and accurately guarded his faith from such admixture. He again and again inculcates and presses the distinction, that the faith which he means is *not* that faith which includes love; that it is a faculty of apprehension simply. 'That faith which apprehends Christ, *not* that which includes love, justifies.' 'Faith is *not* ineffectual till 'joined by charity.' He speaks of it as an insult to faith, and 'making it an empty quality in the soul,' to assert that it depended on the companionship of charity for its effect:—'as if,' he says, 'it could do nothing without *charity*; and when *charity* 'came, *then* was effectual, and *then* was justifying.' 'The 'Apostle attributes the operation (in justification) to faith and 'not to love.' 'Perish the sophists with their accursed gloss, '*Fides formata charitate*:' that 'impious gloss,' that 'pestilent 'gloss.' 'It is by faith sole, not by faith perfected in love, that 'we are justified.' 'Faith may be concreted in works after we 'are justified, but it is faith abstract by which we are justified.' The faith, then, which was the medium of justification in Luther's system, was an extra-moral faith. It was, as far as we can apprehend its nature, which it is not easy to do, the pure abstract faculty of confidence, whereby the mind assures itself of something of which it wants to be assured. As such, it is not untypical of Luther's temper; and the reader, who follows him through his career, or listens to his table-talk, or watches those symptoms of personal character which appear, as they often do, in his theological works, will catch many a trait, and sentiment, which may carry him back to his original dogma.

The great cardinal virtue in Luther's eyes was confidence. He had a special admiration, an enthusiastic affection for that particular faculty of mind, which makes a man inwardly strong and self-supporting. In the description of Adam before the Fall, in his Commentary on Genesis, he gives us his *beau idéal* of a man, and strength and self-confidence enter remarkably into it. Adam shows something of the Herculean model. Thus Luther dwells with animation upon his dominion over the beasts. He describes a character, bearing no slight resemblance to what in modern language we call a master-mind; one endowed with a mysterious power, marvellous self-respect, and instinctive com-

mand over others' wills and movements. Man in his primitive state is the *dominus terræ*, lord of the earth, not by labour, art, and cruelty, but by an innate power and will, to which the whole creation unconsciously bows; and he has this power, because he is true to himself, and feels no distrust within. But with the fall, this inward confidence goes, and all is altered: he shakes like a leaf; is full of terror and alarm, and startles even at the sound of God's approach. Then the beasts shake off their yoke, the earth becomes stubborn and disorderly, and cunning, toil, and misery, succeed to artless and majestic power. The Lutheran Adam is a superior creation to the Calvinistic Adam of Milton; but it is impossible not to see in the character the ruling taste in Luther's mind for the simple faculty of confidence, as the source of strength and happiness. On the contrary, distrust as to our condition, and where we stand, and how God regards us—the least apprehension, fear, and doubt, are simple misery and meanness with him. 'What is more miserable than uncertainty?' he asks again and again, as if Nature herself revolted from it:—that monster of 'uncertainty,' that 'pest of uncertainty,' 'which makes whatsoever thou thinkest, 'speakest, doest, sin.' How could a man be easy with such a disease upon him? How could he worship, how could he serve God the least? And all those texts of Scripture, which describe the confidence of the good and the fear of the wicked, 'The wicked flee when no man pursueth;'—'the wicked are like a troubled sea;'—'there is no peace for the wicked;'—'the righteous are bold as a lion:'—'he that doth evil hateth the light;'—'whatsoever is not of faith is sin;'—'the just shall live by faith,'—were interpreted in this particular sense.

The faith which was the medium in Luther's process of justification, was thus a pure and abstract faculty of confidence, which was efficacious in and out of itself. Believe that you are absolved, and you are absolved—was his teaching as a priest, before he broke from the Church—never mind whether you deserve absolution or no. He that believes is better than he that deserves. Always be sure that you are pleasing to God: if you are sure you are, you are. Feel yourself safe: if you feel safe, you are safe. On the contrary, if you doubt about it, you are condemned, because you are self-condemned. You are not in the image of God then, but in the image of the devil. Recollect yourself; make an effort; believe; be 'certainly resolved that you are in favour with God.' You are then a son of God and a saint; strong, perfect, and triumphant; you go forth like the sun in the heaven, and rejoice like a giant refreshed with wine. You have conquered the world, the flesh,

and the devil, and have trodden hell and darkness under foot.

But this confidence, whatever apparent strength it might attain to, wanted, from the very hypothesis on which Luther's system was built, that reality and basis which Catholic faith has. All faith is, indeed, a sort of confidence; but the confidence of Catholic faith has this remarkable characteristic, that it appeals to positive fact for its basis. Human nature is not, according to Catholic theology, though brought by an incomprehensible mystery under a condition or state of evil, in a totally evil state. It still bears the stamp of its Divine original, has moral tastes and preferences, and a real power of performing acts of various degrees of moral goodness; has memorials of past and pledges of future perfection. Catholic faith, then, with respect to the unseen world, rests upon the actual facts of the seen. Proceeding upon data, it is a faith allied to reason, and not a blind faith. Man has some good in him, therefore he may one day be better, and an ultimate state of acceptableness in God's sight is made credible to him by the fact, that he can make some approaches to such acceptableness now. It is for the same cause, a faith allied to hope. For it is the peculiar characteristic of the faculty of hope to enlarge and advance upon fact as distinct from doing *without* fact altogether; existing fact given, hope can proceed upon it indefinitely; but some ground of fact it must have. The phrase, of 'hoping against hope,' does not suppose the total absence of all such ground, but only the reduction of it to the smallest imaginable quantum. Sailors wrecked in the middle of the sea hope for the sight of a sail, in proportion as they know their situation to be in some general line of navigation, know the traffic on that line to be considerable, know the time of the year to be the customary one for that traffic, and other like data: if they have no data at all for hope, they cannot legitimately hope. So far as faith and hope can be viewed as distinguished from each other, faith takes the negative, and hope the positive side: faith exerts her particular powers in opposing those appearances which are hostile; hope hers in enlarging those appearances which are friendly. Catholic faith, then, as it has existing fact to proceed upon, is a faith allied to hope; nay, so intimately allied, that hope practically precedes faith in the act of belief; and we believe because we hope, rather than hope because we believe: we see an actual ground, however small; hope expands this, and not till then we have faith.

Allied thus to hope and reason, Catholic faith is emphatically a natural kind of faith. It is not violent or forced: it has only to believe in the future expansion and perfection of that



which it now sees. The Christian sees tendencies, and he has to believe in issues; he sees approaches, and he has to believe in fulfilments; he sees a foundation, and he infers a superstructure: he rises by a reasonable ascent from earth to heaven; the visible world contains the elements of the invisible; the kingdom of nature opens by a gradual process into that of grace. The very smallest act of our moral nature connects him by anticipation, with the 'glory which shall be revealed in him.' Though he cannot say, 'It is finished,' he can say, 'It is begun; and in that visible beginning has a solid substratum for the most inspiring belief. Thus, when the great philosopher of our own Church undertook the task of convincing an infidel age of the truth of religion, the line he adopted was that of calling its attention to present visible facts. He told men that they were moral beings, born with the love of virtue and hatred of vice, endowed with generous affections, and with the power of doing virtuous actions,—a power, which could be indefinitely increased by habit and self-discipline: and he proved, next, that this goodness was more or less rewarded. There were then tendencies, he said, which pointed of themselves to some ultimate completion. That which religion taught us did exist to a certain extent now; and, therefore, might exist to a much greater extent hereafter. That is to say, his was a philosophy of hope; it saw in the midst of the wildness and disorder of this present scene some facts which bore in one direction, and hope took up those facts, and enlarged them into a system.

But Luther had no present facts to appeal to according to his system. He had no tendencies and no approaches. And, therefore, though he recognized an unseen world of absolute good, and, in distinction to making evil of the essence of humanity, or irrevocably fixing and perpetuating it in us, pointed to a time when we should be perfectly righteous; and could say—*Justitia tibi parata est in cælo*: 'in a future life, thou shalt be 'cleansed from all sin, cleared of all concupiscence, be pure as 'the sun, and have perfect love:' this unseen world was deprived of all medium to connect it with the seen one, and, therefore, deprived of that evidence which constitutes the legitimate claim to our faith. Of two worlds, of absolute evil and absolute good diametrically opposed, he placed us in the one, and told us to believe in the other. But the natural question immediately arises, why should we? No system of evidences, either in the religious, or in any other department, can dispense with that primary law of all argument—how can we reason but from what we know? Let any basis of fact, however small, be allowed us, and we can build indefinitely upon it; but, if we have no fact at all, we have nothing to build upon. The

faith of Lutheran theology was thus excluded, by the very fundamental principles of that theology, from the reasonable and natural type. The act of faith became rather one of mental power, by which a person, from pure force of will, made himself believe in what there was no ground to believe, than one of natural conviction. It was faith deprived of its membership with the other portions of our spiritual nature; faith without hope, as it was faith without love. Excluded from a reasonable and natural character, it was compelled to assume a fanatical one: faith became assurance. The task of the Christian was to work himself up by strong effort to the belief that he himself was personally saved, was a child of God, was in a state of justification. If the believer asked why, or how, he was to believe, he was told again, Believe; make yourself believe; believe somehow or other. He was urged with arguments enough, addressed to his mere will and sense of personal advantage; was threatened and promised; was told he would be intolerably wretched if he did not believe so, unutterably happy if he did; but ground of reason there was none. Assurance, thus left to assure itself as it could, became an anxious, struggling, and fluctuating gift. It rose and it fell with the state of the spirits, and even state of the body. It was at any moment liable to be upset, and when upset the will had to make another effort to regain it. These struggles, or 'agonies,' occupy a prominent place in the practical or devotional department of Luther's theological system. They are appealed to as the tests of the genuineness and reality of the Christian's belief. Has he been tempted to doubt and despair of his salvation, and has he had to make the most tremendous internal efforts to recover his certainty of it? these are the tokens which a loving but chastising Father sent him of good will and favour. They were the trials to prove him, and stimulants to raise him to a higher degree of assurance than ever. The same reason which gave Luther's faith a fanatical, gave it a personal and individual character too. Genuine faith, as it rests on a large external ground, is wide and social in its object, looks forward to the final issue of this whole system of things, the ultimate triumph of virtue over vice, to the great Day of Judgment and the Restitution of all things. But Luther's faith, as it narrowed its basis, narrowed its object too. Withdrawing from the wide ground of reason and nature, the unsupported faith of mere will, choosing to believe because it wished to do so; as it derived all its strength from the individual, interested itself about the individual only: and faith became, in its whole scope and direction, personal.

Such is that whole system which, amongst ourselves, goes

under the name of Calvinism. It is, of course, wrong, historically speaking, to call Luther a Calvinist, because Luther preceded Calvin, and was the original discoverer of that set of ideas which Calvin only compacted and systematized. But, amongst ourselves, in consequence of our acquaintance having lain more with the Genevan than the German branch of the Reformation, these ideas are associated with the name of Calvin, and, therefore, amongst us, Luther's theology may be designated as Calvinism. No greater contrast, indeed, than that between the personal characters of the German and the Genevan Reformer can be well imagined, and the types of character they have handed down to their respective schools are widely distinct, but their theology is essentially the same.

To return to the point at which we diverged. Luther had now found the solution of his difficulty, and was satisfied. He had encountered a tormenting puzzle, and had now the answer. How could man fulfil the law, was the puzzle; By simple imputation, was the answer. The whole difficulties attending the adherence of evil to our nature, were now explained to Luther. The mystery of Conscience was solved. He had got his *εὐρηκα*. He dwelt upon it, now that he had got it, with deep and untiring relish; he handled it, and embraced it with perpetual mental fondness. He felt like a person possessed of a great secret, for which the whole world had been struggling from its creation, and never yet attained. He felt as Newton might feel when he had discovered the principle of gravitation; or as Harvey might feel when he had discovered the circulation of the blood; or as one of the elder sages might have felt had he discovered the *elixir vitæ*, or the principle of alchemical transmutation. He felt as one of those great philosophers of the ancient world might have felt when he discovered some great moral principle which explained the phenomena of human life, and disclosed the secret of human happiness, like Pythagoras, when he discovered Number; or Zeno, when he discovered Fate; or Epicurus, when he discovered Chance. Every one who has found out a riddle, or put a Chinese puzzle together, or solved a problem in geometry, knows the peculiar satisfaction which attends the climax of solution,—a satisfaction which is, of course, deeper in proportion to the depth and interest of the difficulty. Luther looked back with the feeling of a traveller at rest upon his past struggles and searchings. 'Can you tell me how to fulfil the law?' was the question he asked now, as if the difficulty itself were pleasing, because he felt in possession of the key to it. What is that impossible thing called righteousness which has tortured the human mind from the foundation of the world? Square that circle if you can. Find that

ποῦ στῶ. He saw the whole world wandering in a maze on this subject,

‘Errare atque viam palantes quærere vitæ,’

going round and round, and pursuing their own footsteps; arguing in a circle, and endeavouring to escape from sin by ‘working righteousness,’ which, when worked, only made them feel greater sinners than before. He saw a fatal error, affecting the very foundation of the Christian system, in undisturbed hereditary possession of the whole Christian world; and he saw in himself the person destined to subvert it.

There has been no Indulgence fair at Wittenberg, then, as yet, and no Tetzl, and yet Luther has started. As distinguished from being a mere practical Reformer in the first instance, led on incidentally to doctrine, he was primarily, as we said at the beginning of this article, a doctrinal Reformer, the founder of a new school, the propagator of an idea. He was one of that corps of creative minds who, whether as philosophers or as religionists, Pagan or Christian, have succeeded in permanently impressing their conceptions on large portions of society, and leaving intellectual fraternities behind them. He began with a course of dreaming and speculation. He brooded with keenness and passion upon the great mystery of our moral nature. One particular idea, the boldness of which suited the impatience of his mind, seemed to solve it; and he devoted himself to the promulgation of that idea. A period of four years, commencing with his first entrance into the Augustine Monastery at Erfurt, in 1505, carried on and completed this search and discovery of Luther. In 1509, on the recommendation of Staupitz, the Vicar-General of the Dominican order, upon whom Luther’s trials and struggles, and the intellectual and religious energy they exhibited, had made a great impression, Luther received from the Elector of Saxony the appointment of Professor of Philosophy in the University of Wittenberg, accompanied with a most urgent and complimentary letter from that Prince. In a short time, he received from the Senate of Wittenberg the appointment of City Preacher. He regarded the appointment as an important opening for the promulgation of his great dogma, and was besieged with nervous alarm that he should not be able to turn it to the account he ought to do; but his success equalled his fondest hopes. He preached, by turns, in the Monastery, in the Royal Chapel, and in the Collegiate Church. ‘His voice was fine, sonorous, clear, striking; his gesticulation emphatic and dignified.’ He departed wholly from the established type of sermon, quoting, instead of the schoolmen, the Bible, especially St. Paul’s Epistles. The

degree of Bachelor in Theology enabled him to add to these sermons University lectures on the sacred text; and 'never, in any Saxon professional chair, was heard such luminous explanation.' He delighted in these lectures, and passed whole nights in preparing for them. 'Eminent doctors came to listen, and retired full of admiration. The venerable Pollich, known by the soubriquet of *Lux Mundi*, heard him, and struck with wonder, exclaimed, "This father hath profound insight, exceeding imagination; he will trouble the doctors before he has done." In addition to his Academical posts, he was, by the appointment of his patron, Staupitz, made visitor of the monasteries in that province. In a letter to a friend, he writes, 'I had need of two secretaries to keep up my correspondence; pity my unhappy fortune. I am conventual concionator, table-preacher, director of studies; I am vicar, or, in words, eleven priors in one; conservator of the ponds of Litzkau, pleader and assessor at Torgau, Paulinic reader, and collector of all psalms; add to all these, the assaults of the world, the flesh, and the devil.' His reputation extended, and he preached in the castle at Dresden before Duke George. In 1516, he commenced the publication of a series of theses, which, under the cover of the disputative system of the day, attacked the established doctrines on the point of justification, and put forth those views of the exclusive necessity of faith, the inefficacy of works, and the slavery of the will, which it was the aim of all his future theological labours to establish. Five papers, *φωνήματα σωφροσύνης*, containing respectively, twelve, ninety-five, fifty, forty, and a hundred propositions, alarmed the old, and awakened the new intellect in the Church.

But the time now approached when Luther was to add the department of practical to that of doctrinal Reformer, and, taking his dogma along with him, to prepare the ground for its reception by an attack on a whole existing practical system. It is obvious that the teacher of a new doctrine cannot do his work extensively and zealously without becoming a practical man to do so. He is bound to attack what stands in his way, and occupies the ground, and he thus necessarily finds himself at war with a whole mass of existing interests and machinery; the doctrinal line necessarily leads into the practical. Such a practical line was, moreover, not at all uncongenial to Luther's character, even that internal and speculative part of it which is the only one we have as yet had before us. We have seen him a sort of dreamer, indeed, and a visionary; intent upon the difficulties of the spiritual and metaphysical world, and struggling with the great mystery of evil; but it is this visionary and internal line of thought which often produces the most porten-

tous energy in action. Thus, the general alliance which has been observed between infidelity and radicalism, though the one is theoretic, the other practical. The French Revolution itself, with all its tremendous exhibition of practical power, issued out of a philosophy which seemed concerned only with the abstract universe, and to be discontented with the constitution of things. As we examine deeper, we discern the most intense passion involved in such speculation. The sensitive and keen temper moves in the department of philosophy, as if it were a dramatic sphere—perceives apparent defect and injustice in the system of the world—is angry, as if it had received a visible wrong and affront—and rushes into atheism out of revenge. And the same temper is, for the same reason, furious with respect to the abuses and grievances of the social and practical world. Luther's reveries upon the workings of the moral law, and the obstinacy of the evil principle in nature, how it pursued us, and found us out even in our best acts, fastened on us, and refused to be shaken off; accused, condemned, and humiliated us; that passionate and querimonious temper which felt the temptation to rebel against the system of things, on account of evil in the abstract, indicated just a mind most ready to break out, when the opportunity arrived, against the evils of the practical and concrete world, the abuses and grievances, the frauds and cheats, the pride of the great, and the insolence of the strong, which the established system of the day displayed.

If there ever was an age in which the external and working system of the Church was calculated to provoke and excite such a mind to action, it was the age in which Luther lived. It exhibited that peculiar mixture, so poignantly irritating to a keen temper, of the grossest abuses with the most placid and easy self-complacency in those who maintained, and were responsible for them. The Court of Rome allowed the lowest fraud and imposture in the working system of the Church, and suffered faith and reason to be shocked, itself all the while reposing in a superciliously intellectual, and even rationalizing philosophy. There is something in the honest belief in a system, however erroneous itself, which tends to soften and disarm a complainer; but it was rather too much for the Court of Rome to expect of a class of sensitive intellects, which were then rising up in the Church, that they were calmly to embrace all the lies of her practical system, while she herself did not believe them, and was laughing in her sleeve. There was impatience and self-will, doubtless, in the spirit in which the Continental Reformers raised and carried on their opposition; but Rome itself had certainly no right to complain of it. If they were



guilty, she was not innocent, nor has she any right, on the field of controversy, to assume that position which she does, of having been sinned against without having sinned. The human mind was entering, then, on a new and mysterious stage of its history; and that great intellectual movement which has been steadily advancing ever since, and trying the world's faith in its progress, had begun. Rome herself partook largely of that revival. Did she bear the test well, and set the example so much wanted at the commencement of such a movement, of intellect not really opposing faith? or, dazzled herself, and carried away by the revival, did she set the whole world the very contrary example, of intellect undermining faith? Did she, when she headed that intellectual movement, teach the world how to bear it? We have the answer to the question in the accounts transmitted to us of a Papal Court which seemed, by some inebriation of the intellect, to have dreamed itself out of Christianity into paganism, ignored, by a sort of common consent, the Gospel Revelation, and instituted again the Groves of Academus. An elegant heathen Pope, who carried on Tusculan Disputations; Cardinals who adorned their walls with scenes from Ovid's Metamorphoses, and devoted themselves to Ciceronian Latin; and a whole scene of luxurious intellectuality in Rome, contrasted bitterly with the palpable superstitions and abuses of the out-of-doors world; and the centre of Christendom, putting itself quietly and unconcernedly *ab extra* to a whole system for which it was responsible, while it taught men to despise that system, provoked at the same time disgust and rebellion against its own hypocrisy. Nor did the intellectual movement of the age show better fruits in the morals than in the faith of the Roman Court. The morals of the Roman ecclesiastics were scandalous, and it was only a question whether their vices themselves, or the shamelessness with which they indulged them, was the worse feature.

We shall not dwell upon a scene with which our readers are already sufficiently familiar, that of the sale of Indulgences in Germany in the year 1517, conducted by the Dominican monk Tetzel. It is enough to say that it signally exhibited the impostures and abuses of that system. Coarse, bold, and brazen,—there is strong reason for adding, immoral,—Tetzel carried out the system with a swing, and, intent solely on performing his office with practical efficiency, hawked his commodity, in the perfect unconsciousness of vulgar zeal, in churches, public streets, taverns, and alehouses, like a spirited man of business. At a cross set up in the market-place, from which the Pope's arms were suspended, the auctioneer extolled the merits of his article, and announced that as soon as ever 'the money chinked' in

Tetzel's box, sin to that amount was forgiven; the crowd standing about with a mixture of fun and business, as it does in a fair. In the course of his rounds he came to Juterbock, four miles from Wittemberg. Luther's indignation rose as he surveyed the scene. He waited till the approach of All Saints' day brought a crowd of pilgrims to Wittemberg, and on the eve of that day fastened on the church doors ninety-five theses against Indulgences,—copies of which, accompanied with letters of remonstrance, he sent to Albert, Archbishop of Magdeburg, and Jerome, Bishop of Brandenburg, within whose jurisdiction the traffic was going on, and to the former of whom half the proceeds of it were farmed.

Luther now stood before the world as a Reformer; and, as such, the authorities of the Roman Church met him with one aim and policy. Some were for mild suppression; others for fierce suppression; but all were for simple suppression. It was a disturbance, and it must be put down. Tetzel himself erected a scaffold in one of the promenades of Frankfort; walked in procession to it with his insignia as inquisitor of the faith; preached a sermon; ordered the heretic to be brought forward for punishment; placed the theses on the scaffold, and burnt them. The view of Prierias, the Pope's Censor, who answered Luther from Rome, was, 'Dogs must be barking. O dear Luther, wert thou to receive from our lord the Pope a good Bishopric, thou wouldst sing smaller, and even preach up the Indulgence, which it is now thy pleasure to vilify.' 'It is high treason,' exclaimed Hochstraten, the Inquisitor of Cologne, 'against the Church to leave such a heretic alive another hour. Erect instantly the scaffold for him!' The general view of those in power, less passionately expressed, was essentially the same. Scultet, Bishop of Brandenburg, a man of mildness and finesse, in a civil answer to Luther's letter, commended his zeal, and admitted that there was occasion for it, but told him to be quiet. Leo himself, ever easy and good-tempered, after once persuading himself to take a serious view of the subject, and descending from his lofty contempt for both sides in the contest, saw no other line but the established and traditionary one of mere suppression. Such was the policy; and the policy suggested its own means. Luther must be possessed in person; the man must be got hold of. The Court addressed itself with a mechanical instinct to that one point. Form, gravity, decorum, kindness, were observed in the means; but Italian sagacity was clear as to the end, and knew that the best way to treat with a foe was to secure him first. Luther once in Rome, away from friends, and removed from sympathy and aid; ecclesiastical justice would have a comparatively easy task; and one of two

alternatives must follow, either that he should not leave it at all, or leave it a vanquished and tamed man.

But Italian policy, however sagacious and clear, had in Luther a difficult foe to deal with, and Rome was destined to find its match. The only effect which the observation of this aim on the part of Rome had on Luther, was to excite in him, in addition to his original grievance, a deep and inexpressible indignation that it should be met in that way; that the only answer to a witness against wrong should be a move to incarcerate him. 'Was it not a shame that these people set so high a price 'upon him?' He saw himself regarded as vermin, to be trodden and stamped upon; as something whose proper fate was simple effacement; and the bitterness of a double wrong now invigorated and sharpened him for the contest. There mixed with this indignation no slight disdain at the idea that such a line of proceeding should be supposed at all probable to succeed with him. Awake to those vast energies which were fast rising into life within him, and full of conscious power, he resented, while he despised, the audacity of men who could presume to imagine that *he* was to be caught by such strategics. Did they think him a simpleton, or what were they thinking of, to think that a possible thing? A mortal jealousy of Italian subtlety only put him the more on his mettle, and inflamed him. Luther was peculiarly of that temper which has a horror of being taken in, and is haunted by the '*decipi turpe est.*' The Italian was by national character and careful cultivation a diplomatist. He had that character, especially in Germany. The German felt himself no match for him, and retaliated by dislike and suspicion. The dread of an Italian was proverbial; an undefinable notion of his unlimited powers of deception pervaded the mass, and one German warned another as he approached. He was advancing now to the contest with his practised penetration, his easy address, his whole art and science of management; and he promised himself an easy victory over the poor simple German. Luther's gall rose at the idea. Would he find it so easy? and would he find him quite so poor simple a German? Why should not a German assume the Italian for once, and establish some small pretension to tact and policy? It seems to have been in connexion with feelings like these that Luther gave himself that *carte-blanche* for dissimulation which he used throughout all the stages of his struggle with Rome in which dissimulation was wanted. He certainly did meet the Italians here with their own weapon. He stuck at no disguises, no professions of humility, affection, reverence, and modesty, which simple language could supply, whenever his position called for them. Passion indeed is the prominent feature in Luther's character,

and it does not appear at first sight as if passion and dissimulation would well go together; but they often do. Dissimulation is, after all, only a tool for accomplishing an object; and passion, which is clear-sighted enough to see this, will make use of that tool as it makes use of others. It will feel a relish in the employment of it, just as it will in the directly martial and openly hostile exercises of its calling, and even exult and triumph in it, in proportion as it is alive to its peculiar efficacy. Indeed, dissimulation will thus become a positive expression of passion; its success affords the most pungent gratification which there is to scorn, and passion specially delights in scorn; the deceiver feels that in deceiving he humiliates and degrades. Luther was as powerful a dissembler as he was an assailant. Formed just on the most formidable model in the whole workshop of character, with a degree of passion which would have driven any ordinary mortal into madness, he combined a perfect mastery and control of it, which converted it into a tool. An easy skill and a strong hand turned it about at pleasure. He did what he liked with it. He rode it as a skilful equestrian rides his high-mettled horse. He played with it as a conjuror plays with his balls, jerking and recalling them at will, and keeping them tossing in the air about him, but still obedient to the centre of attraction in himself. 'I never write so well,' he said, 'as when I am angry.' But the change from superciliousness to deference, from rage to flattery, from hatred to affection, was ready at a moment's notice, and the instrument always gave the proper note at a touch.

With these general lines of policy prepared on both sides, hostilities commenced. The first act was a citation from the Pope to Luther to appear personally, within sixty days, at Rome. The indictments were framed; an ecclesiastical court was appointed to try his case; and the only thing wanted was the presence of the offender. 'I saw,' says Luther, 'the thunderbolt launched against me: I was the sheep that muddled the wolf's water. Tetzel escaped, and I was to let myself be eaten.' Thrown upon himself, and confronted with imminent danger thus immediately in the contest, Luther met the emergency with the utmost coolness and self-possession. There is not a symptom of its ever having entered into his head to obey the citation; whatever happened, he had made up his mind that he would never let himself be dragged to Rome. But the resoluteness of the determination betrayed itself by no word of violence or pride. A letter from the University of Wittemberg, with many expressions of deep reverence for the Holy See, interceded for its professor, who, 'on account of the state of his health, and the dangers attending the journey, was not able to

'undertake what he would otherwise be most anxious to do;' adding, 'Most holy father, our brother is indeed worthy of credit: and as for his theses against Indulgences, they are merely disputatory. He has merely exercised his right of debating freely, and has asserted nothing.' An arrangement entered into at the same time with the Elector Frederick, that the latter should decline to give Luther a safe passport to Rome, supplied him with a still more efficient and respectable excuse.

The next attempt on the part of the Papal Court was conducted by a Nuncio in person. Cardinal Cajetan was at this time in Germany, returning from an unsuccessful mission on which he had been sent for exciting a war against the Turks. He was commissioned to undertake Luther's case, and received summary instructions 'to get hold of him, keep him safely, and bring him to Rome.' An honest, vehement man, without the ordinary tact of an Italian envoy, he was accompanied by an *attaché* who in some measure supplied his deficiency, Urban di Serra Longa, an Italian courtier, whose long residence in a diplomatic character in Germany had familiarized him with the national character, and made him a peculiarly fit man for dealing with a German. The Cardinal cited Luther to Augsburg; and Luther went, receiving warnings at every step to be on his guard against the sly Italians. John Kestner, of Wittenberg, provisor of the Cordeliers, was full of apprehension for his brother—'Thou wilt find Italians at Augsburg, brother, who are learned folks, subtle antagonists, and will give thee a great deal of trouble. I fear thou wilt not be able to maintain thy cause against them; they will throw thee in the fire, and consume thee in the flames.' Doctor Auerbach, of Leipsic, repeated the note of warning—'The Italians are not to be trusted.' Prebend Adelman, of Leipsic, repeated it after him. There was small need for impressing it upon Luther. Arrived at Augsburg, he was waited on by Serra Longa, who took the line of advising him, as a sensible man, to submit himself to the Cardinal without reserve. 'Come,' he concluded, 'the Cardinal is waiting for you. I will escort you to him myself. Fear nothing; all will be over soon, and without difficulty.' Luther heard him with respect, and expressed himself as perfectly ready to meet the Cardinal; but he wanted one thing before doing so—a safe conduct. 'A safe conduct? Do not think of asking for one; the legate is well disposed, and quite ready to end the affair amicably. If you ask for a safe conduct, you will

<sup>1</sup> 'Braccio cogas atque compellas, ut eo in potestate tua redacto eum sub fidei custodia retineas, ut coram nobis sistatur.'

'spoil your business.' The *attaché's* assurance was confirmed by the rest of the Cardinal's suite: 'The Cardinal assures you of his grace and favour;' 'the Cardinal is a father, full of compassion.' Luther expressed no distrust in him, but wanted a safe conduct.

The safe conduct came, and Luther presented himself before the Cardinal, secure and humble. Prostrating himself first, he waited for one command to raise him to his knees, and another to raise him to his legs. After a silence, in which the Cardinal expected him to speak, but Luther humbly waited to be addressed, the conference commenced. Cajetan was stern, brief, and summary, and simply demanded retractation. Luther required argument to prove that he was wrong. For several successive interviews the same game went on, and Luther suggested argument, and the Cardinal repelled it. As Luther, however, remained cool, while the Cardinal became angry and heated, the balance of the discussion at last inclined in the former's favour, and he caught the Cardinal in a trap,—one sufficiently frivolous, indeed, but according to the technical laws of logic acknowledged in that day, decisive argumentatively. One of Luther's objectionable theses was, that 'the treasure of Indulgences was not composed of the merits and sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ.' The Cardinal asserted this to be flatly contradictory to the *extravagante* of Pope Clement. Luther challenged him to prove it, and the challenge was caught eagerly. The *extravagante* was produced and read, till they came to the words 'the Lord Jesus Christ has acquired the treasure by his sufferings.' 'Pause there,' said Luther. 'Most reverend father, be good enough carefully to consider and reflect on that phrase, "He has acquired." Christ has acquired a treasure by his merits; the merits, therefore, are not the treasure; for, to speak with philosophers, the cause is different from the things which flow from it.' Cajetan had committed a mistake in being enticed into an argument, and did not regain his position.

Luther, having puzzled the Cardinal, and done all he had to do; having noticed, too, symptoms of irascibility in his judge, from whom he began to receive first offers and then threats of a safe conduct to Rome, resolved to take his leave; leaving with his friends, first, a note to the Cardinal, explaining that the smallness of his resources did not allow him to protract his stay in Augsburg; and, secondly, an appeal to the Pope, whereby the Cardinal's hands were tied, and any retaliatory sentence to which his offended dignity might incline him, stopped. Before the morning light he mounted a horse, issued out of a small gate in the city, which a town-councillor had directed to be



open for him, and left Augsburg at a gallop. His feelings on his return to Wittenberg were those of bitter merriment, not softened by the sight, which he then for the first time had, of the written directions contained in the Pope's brief to the Cardinal. 'The Cardinal would fain have had me in his hands, and sent me to Rome. He is vexed, I warrant, that I have escaped him. He fancied he was master of me in Augsburg; he thought he had me; but he had got the eel by the tail.'

The issue of the conference at Augsburg was a disappointment at Rome; the fault was thrown upon Cajetan's stiffness and asperity, and care was taken that the next Nuncio should be a different man. Charles Von Miltitz, Chamberlain to the Pope, was a German, in itself a recommendation; he was also a man of an open, frank exterior, and abundance of *bonhomie*. He and Luther met at Altenburg, on the 5th of January, 1519, spent several convivial days together, and were mutually charmed with each other's company, good-humour, and jocularity. The tone of Miltitz was most grateful to a man in Luther's position: 'You are drawing all the world away from the Pope: as for taking you to Rome, an army of twenty thousand would not be able to do it; you now are three to one against us.' He laughed over the incidents of his journey, and told good stories. "'What think you of the Roman seat [see]?" I asked one of the hostesses on my road. "Seats," said she, "how should I know; are they wood or stone?"' The time passed pleasantly away, and the two excellent friends parted with embraces, and on Miltitz's side with tears. 'I did not,' said Luther, in writing to a friend, 'let it be seen that I thought the kiss Judas's kiss, and the tears crocodile's tears. The impostor, the liar! He has in his pocket seventy apostolical briefs, for leading me bound and captive to that murderous Rome.' Miltitz retired from this and a subsequent meeting with the notion that he had completely brought Luther round, and made him consent to silencing conditions. But the conditions were nugatory ones. Luther consented to declare himself an obedient child of the Roman See; and consented to promise that he would invite the people to be as obedient as himself; he consented to be silent if his opponents were silent, and finally consented to the appointment of some Archbishop as his judge. The three former conditions are on their very surface trifles: with respect to the last one, he did not care who judged him, so long as the judge came to Luther in Germany, and Luther had not to go to him at Rome. The Nuncio was as completely cheated as he wished to cheat; and Luther from his first reflection on the commencement of the

conference, 'I know the fox,' to the concluding one, 'The farce is over,' showed an expertness of dissimulation, for which, in an untutored and inexperienced man, even the shrewdest diplomatist could be pardonably unprepared.

Meantime, as regards the reforming movement itself, the greatest caution was exercised in the mode of conducting it. To such a degree, indeed, did Luther carry his caution with respect to his theses, the subject of all these conferences, that he would not formally admit that they were expressions of his own opinion at all. They were theses, subjects suggested for disputation, and upon which theologians were invited to exercise their argumentative power and skill. Some might take one side, some another; he had never asserted which side he himself took upon each of these ninety-five. That he had a general objection to the present mode in which Indulgences were given was indeed obvious, but he had asserted no doctrine. Thus adroitly availing himself of existing machinery, he nurtured the first tender seed of the Reformation underneath the shelter of the old disputative system. Again, as he was not responsible for the theses themselves, so neither was he for their publication. He had stuck them on the doors of the church of All Saints at Wittenberg, the usual process in announcing subjects for disputation; but who copied them thence, or how it was they were now circulating through all the towns of Germany, he had no idea. He had not done it; if others had, he could not help that. 'Is all this noise made,' he writes in his first letter to the Pope, after the publication of his theses, 'because I have simply exerted my right as a master of theology, and disputed in the public schools? Why, this is done in all universities, and these disputes take place on much more sacred subjects than indulgences. What fate brings my poor disputations into so much greater prominence than those of other masters in theology, and makes them circulate all the world over, is a miracle to me. I only published them for the sake of our people here; and how the mass understand a set of questions, put enigmatically and obscurely, as disputative ones always are, is incomprehensible to me. . . . What can I do? I am not able to recall them from circulation now, however their circulation may annoy me. I find myself brought reluctantly before the world, and exposed to every sort of criticism; an unlearned, dull, ignorant man is scrutinized by an age of cultivation and science, which could drive Cicero himself into a corner. It is my fate to be the goose hissing among the swans. . . . All I can do is to prostrate myself at your feet—*vivifica, occide; voca, revoca; approba, reproba, ut placuerit.*'

Again,—‘ I have nothing I can do: I cannot bear your anger, and how to rescue myself from it I know not. I am asked to recall my theses. If that would do any good I would do it immediately. But the truth is, that, owing to the opposition they have met with, they are circulating more widely than I ever dreamed of, and have taken such powerful hold of many minds, that they cannot be recalled. Nay, in this age of intellect and learning, it would be an injury to the Church of Rome herself to recall them, and that is the very last thing which, as a reverential son of the Roman Church, I could do.’ The attitude which Luther assumed towards the Pope was that of a person who found a great stir of opinion going on, over which he had no control, and which he rather regretted than not. His expressions as to himself, the most debasing which language could produce, confirmed this attitude. ‘ Refuse of mankind, and dust of the earth, necessity alone is my excuse for presuming to address your Blessedness. Deign to lower the ear of your Blessedness to the beatings of your lamb. The lowest and vilest of mankind, wretched and poor, I prostrate my unworthy self at your feet.’

We approach, in this latter specimen indeed, one whole class of expressions, which specially arrests the eye of the reader of Luther’s life, and upon which some notice seems required. Luther always described himself as having begun his reforming career under an all but intolerable weight of dejection, the consequence of his own low idea of himself, and exalted reverence for the system and the men whom he found himself opposing. ‘ I began in great fear and trembling,’ he tells Erasmus. ‘ Who was I then, poor, miserable, contemptible brother that I was, more like a corpse than a man; who was I to set myself up against the majesty of the Pope, before whom trembled not only the kings of the earth, and the whole world, but also, if I may so say, heaven and hell? No one can know what my heart suffered in those first two years, and into what depression, I might say into what despair, I was plunged. . . . I was not so joyous, so tranquil, so confident of success. There were, it is true, many pious Christians whom my propositions pleased much, but I could not consider them as mouth-pieces of the Holy Ghost: I looked only to the cardinals, the bishops, the theologians, the jurisconsults, the monks, the priests. . . . It was thence I expected the Spirit to breathe upon me. . . . I did honour the Pope’s Church from the bottom of my heart as the true Church. . . . Had I despised the Pope, I should have trembled to see the earth open and swallow me up alive, like Corah.’ With such signs of deep humility and respect for authorities did Luther conduct the Reformation through its

early stages, and the question which naturally occurs is, how much of it was real, and how much of it not. The answer to such a question is provided for us by that science of character, which an increasing general experience of the various forms of character, subtle as well as simple, has now made comparatively easy and plain. It is quite safe to say, in the first place, that Luther's mental abasement before the Pope and Cardinals was partly real and partly unreal; and it is equally safe to say, in the second place, that where reality and unreality divide the ground, the unreality almost necessarily predominates over the reality. Luther had, to use a word of common parlance, a strong element of 'Jesuitism' in his nature. Without saying what at the time he did not think or feel, he could throw himself artificially into states of mind, out of which such thoughts and feelings proceeded. To a mind midway between two systems, an old one to which it had belonged, and a new one to which it was just going to belong, the present ground did not wholly extinguish the past one. Minds cannot absolutely annihilate their former state; and if there was a corner in which the old feeling existed in Luther's mind, it is the characteristic of such a mind to be able to summon it forth, and use and expand it upon occasion. The insincerity of such a mind rather lies in voluntarily, and with politic aim, exaggerating and inflating some real particle of feeling, than in feigning one which simply does not exist. Luther, in moulding his attitude to Rome, threw himself into a state of mind in which he 'thought the Cardinals, theologians, jurisconsults of Rome, the mouth-pieces of the Holy 'Ghost;' i. e. he allowed the imposing and magnificent characteristics of the Roman system to have their effect upon him, and impress him for the time that such an impression was wanted. An act of the will produced an attitude of feeling; and a species of humility arose, so subtle, mixed, and evasive, that an observer can hardly catch it with sufficient distinctness to pronounce accurately what it was. We notice the same fine and intangible character in his apology for that part of his conduct which showed apparent want of humility: the appearance being admitted and thus explained:—'Truth will gain 'no more by my modesty than it will lose by my presumption. '..... Who does not know that nobody puts forward a new 'idea without appearing to manifest some pride?..... The 'Bishops begin to perceive that they ought to have done what 'I am doing, and they are ashamed. They call me proud and 'audacious, and I do not deny that I am so. But they are not 'men to know what God is and what we are.'

To this general *rationale* of Luther's reverence for the Pope, Cardinals, and Roman Church, must be added the liberty which

the religious journeyer sometimes takes of expressing to the full his adherence to the old system, till he has consummated his transition to the new. Luther certainly expressed the fullest loyalty in public for the Roman system, at a time when it was impossible he should, and when, as a matter of fact, he did not feel it. On the 3d of March, he wrote to the Pope:—‘Before God and his whole creation I testify, that I have never wished, and do not wish now, to touch by any means or craftiness your power, or that of the Roman Church, but confess fully that that Church is supreme over all, and that nothing in heaven or earth, save our Lord Jesus Christ only, is to be preferred to it.’ On the 12th of the same month he wrote to his friend Spalatin:—‘I know not whether the Pope is Anti-Christ in person or his apostle.’ If asked, he would probably have justified the opposition between these two passages, on the ground that the one was public and the other private, and that they suited respectively the two sides of his position.

Such was Luther’s policy at the commencement of his career. Let no one refer to the success of that career as an instance of success attending simple boldness and impetuosity. Luther was always the politician, and a resolutely cautious one. With a boldness equal to facing the blindest hazard, he never moved without a definite pledge of security. He obstinately insisted on safe conducts. ‘*Vivat Christus, moriatur Martinus*,’ he exclaimed on his journey to Augsburg; but he took care to meet Cajetan with a safe conduct in his hands. ‘I will go there, though I find as many devils as there are tiles on the house-top,’ he said, before his journey to Worms: but he took care that an imperial herald conducted him there. He proved the saying, that fear mixes largely with true courage, and that the better part of valour is discretion. Follow him step by step, and you see him the shrewd diplomatist, parrying invitations, rejecting offers, penetrating disguises. By this course of policy he kept himself out of Rome and in Germany. He kept himself among sympathizing and admiring friends, preaching, writing, and talking, and disseminating his ideas in every way. He gained time for the formation of a party. His popular winning character only required the congenial national sphere to act in, to make itself felt; and to be in Germany was to grow and prosper. ‘Martin,’ says a contemporary, who is describing him at this period of his life, ‘is of the middle height; cares and studies have made him so thin, that one may count all the bones in his body; yet he is in all the force and verdure of his age. His voice is clear and piercing: he is never at a loss, and has at his disposal a world of thoughts and words. In his

' conversation he is agreeable and easy, and there is nothing hard or austere in his air. He permits himself to enjoy the pleasures of life. In society he is gay, jocund, and unembarrassed; and possesses a perfect serenity of countenance despite of the atrocious menaces of his enemies.' The sweetness and fascination which mingled with the power of his character sent away the crowds, who came to Wittemberg from curiosity, disciples and propagandists: their reports brought other crowds, and Wittemberg became the sacred city of the new school. As the young student of a distant province caught the first sight of the spires of Wittemberg, he raised his hands to heaven and praised God that He had made the light to shine on that city, as He had before upon Sion. The disputative exhibitions of the day aided him. They kept up excitement, and supplied public and striking scenes in which Luther appeared to remarkable advantage. All the talent and literature of the day crowded to those disputations; they were the amusement of the intellectual world; people came from the greatest distances; there was a general contact of minds, and the formation of a public opinion was the result. It was at one of these scenes that Melancthon was gained. The great disputation at Leipsic brought together all the young theologians of Germany, and Luther did immense execution. Pitted greatly to his advantage against the sharpest, noisiest, most vain, impudent, and unscrupulous disputant of the age, he won at one morning many of the subsequent lights of the Reformation. Thus serviceable with respect to the mass, the same interval was equally serviceable in gaining over nobles and princes too. Luther moved in an age in which not the many but the few governed; under the surveillance of German Electors, Dukes and Landgraves, who had no interest in his doctrines except a selfish one, and who were bound to watch with some jealousy, however welcome he might be as an opponent of the Pope, the career of a popular leader and mover of masses. The moderation and caution of Luther's opening policy was just the feature to recommend him to them. Had he shown himself a mere agitator and addresser of masses, he would have stood in an unfavourable attitude towards the Courts. They would have distrusted and disliked him. Summary suppression is the frequent fate of agitators: it was the fate of John Huss and Jerome of Prague; and the German princes would probably have stood by with considerable indifference and seen Luther carried off by some Papal Envoy, had he shown himself only an agitator as those early Reformers had. But they saw in Luther the politician and the diplomatist, and they respected him. He had sympathies with Courts and Governments as well as with masses; he had



obvious weight and solidity; he had the stamp of practical power upon him; he had all the appearance of one who could found, and fix, and not only preach a theology. The consequence was that they took to him. The Elector Frederick, his own sovereign, a timid and wavering man, who would have been offended at any spectacle of simple vehemence and passion, was his firm friend, and a considerable body of princes were resolved to see fair play.

The time now came when the fruits of this policy appeared, and when Luther, throwing off all disguise, and breaking fairly with the Pope, was enabled to take his stand confidently on the ground which he had made. In the April of 1521, Luther, having already committed the overt act of rebellion, and burnt the Pope's Bull publicly at Wittemberg, appeared to take his trial before the Diet of Worms. No contrast can be imagined greater than that between Luther's whole figure and position, as it actually was now, and what it would have been had any precipitancy or carelessness handed him over prematurely to the Roman power. Tried prematurely in his career, and tried at Rome, he would have stood before his Roman judges a criminal at the bar; a disturber and breaker of the peace, little more respectable than a common highwayman. As it was, he appeared more as a conqueror than a criminal; the very scene which was intended to suppress him was his greatest elevation, and his condemnation established him in the position of a successful and recognised Reformer. With a safe conduct,—in the circumstances in which he was inviolable—he presented himself secure, erect, and self-possessed: he could not be touched; he was a dignified spectator of the august ceremonial; the great man whom it really honoured; he was received in state, and treated almost like an independent potentate, within the Imperial assembly. Between his position and that of his ill-fated predecessor John Huss, there was all the difference that there is between a prisoner and a visitor: Huss went to the Diet at Prague to be tried; Luther went to Worms to pay his respects. His journey to Worms was a triumphal march. Every step brought him across some flattering marks of sympathy and respect, public and private. As he passed from town to town, burgomasters and councillors vied in their hospitality, and crowds gazed at him with wonder. On arriving at Worms, princes, nobles, and students flocked around him. He entered the hall of trial and saw his friends on all sides. The greatness of the occasion oppressed him indeed at times, and in private he had moments of that dejection and nervousness which nature itself feels when going to figure in extraordinary scenes. Simple conspicuousness is oppressive;

and to sustain the full gaze of such an assembly, and go through the ordeal of question and answer, in a way which became Luther's position and pretensions, required all Luther's courage and confidence. But his real position was already made, and now he had only to act up to it: for a whole week he was pressed by the assembled Diet to recant; for a whole week he repeated his refusal. An imperial edict then placed him under the ban of the empire, and the ceremonial was over. Nobody thought of obeying the edict, and the terrible sentence which consigned him to imprisonment, and forbade anybody harbouring and feeding him, passed off as a farce. Luther, after a temporary residence in the Elector's castle at Wartburg, returned to Wittenberg, preached, wrote, published, and superintended the formation of his own Church. The next year's Diet at Nuremberg exhibited the Papal power in a state of such deplorable feebleness, that it seemed to have enough to do to fight for its own safety without aspiring to conquest. Cheregat, the Papal legate, met the assembly with language such as Rome had never before been known to use, of the most humble and sad confession. He acknowledged that the Church wanted reform, and the see of S. Peter first and principally: Rome had been guilty of profaneness, oppression, and all scandals, and reform should therefore descend from the head to the members, and purify the Church at large by purifying its centre. Elevated by this language, the Diet drew up its *centum gravamina* against the Roman See, and with much bitterness of tone demanded redress. A feeble call for an execution of the edict of Worms was quashed at once by several of the princes, and a prostrate Papacy gave Luther not only safety but triumph.

In reviewing the external causes which fixed the Reformer in such a strong position, we find an intellectual and a religious one. The young and fresh intellect of the day was mainly with Luther. Progress was the word; it was the thing to go after him; Luther was all the fashion. A bold original mind, by the side of the cut-and-dried cleverness, technicality, and hackneyed disputativeness of the old theology, captivated especially the young: it seemed as if people who held back from him owed an apology to the intellectual world, and had to show cause why they should not be set down as, however worthy and well-meaning, a sadly dull, old-fashioned class. People see the intellectual defects of an old familiar system, and not those of a new and strange one, and rush into novelty in order that they may enjoy the sensation of possessing truth, free from all accompanying sensation of drawbacks. Moreover, the argument on the side of his opponents in support of the old system

was contemptibly feeble. On the great and fundamental question, which the dispute instantly brought up, viz. who was the judge of controversies of faith, Luther had a really strong ground, and intellectual men saw it. It was a ground, indeed, simply negative, and on that very account a much easier one to maintain than that of his opponents; but, as a negative argument, it was irresistibly strong: he asked them to prove that the Pope was this judge—and that the Roman Catholic could not prove. It was plain that the latter's ground was weak here, and Luther had only to ask his question in order to manifest and bring out that weakness. He retired from the disputation with the appearance of a person who knows he has given a challenge which cannot be answered, and demanded a proof which cannot be given. It added to the strength of this negative position, that the other side were so wholly unprepared for encountering it: the Papal monarchy was a first principle with Luther's opponents; they had never reasoned, or thought it necessary to reason about it; it stood on a par with Christianity itself; the fact had grown up with their growth, and was part of themselves; their minds simply reflected an established system, and could not put themselves *ab extra* to it, as argument requires. When they had brought Luther to deny the authority of the Pope, they went away pleased and triumphant, as if they had gained a plain *reductio ad absurdum*. But it was impossible that the excited intellect of a new school of thinkers should not see the absence of real argument on such a question. The abuses of private judgment have sometimes naturally warped the intellect in favour of the Papal claims, but the abuses of the Papacy then exposed it to the examination of a not only impartial, but unfriendly intellect. An unfriendly intellect was a rigid one, and demanded argumentative proof; and that proof not being forthcoming, an intellectual triumph was on the side of him who gave the challenge, and an intellectual defeat on theirs who had not answered it. The puzzler, the questioner, was the victorious party; and Luther represented immediately the intellect of the day, the spirit of inquiry and criticism, which, not content with existing facts, required an explanation of them, and went back to first principles. Of two parties who were combating, one examined, the other simply asserted, and aimed at silencing its opponent by that simple force of assertion: the sympathies of the intellectual spirit were enlisted in favour of the inquirer, and against his dogmatic silencer.

Again, a religious reason operated in fixing Luther in his position. Whatever amount of religion there might be going on within the Roman Church of that day, and whatever

aggregate of good and holy men there might be, actually and numerically in her, this religion did not come to the top, and take its proper leading place. The Church, acting as a whole, and exhibiting herself, in her central government, through her officials and mouthpieces, in her managing and ruling parties, showed lamely, in a religious point of view, before the world. The profligacy of the ecclesiastics of the Roman Court itself was notorious : and the Bishops at large had managed to raise against themselves a strong popular charge of pride and luxury, which it is impossible for the fairest reader of history to overlook. The particular men whom the Papal Court sent from time to time to confront Luther showed the defect ; they were clever, active, shrewd, and elegant men, who had mixed with courts, and who had taken part in the literary revival of the age. Cajetan was a serious, indeed, though an ordinary man ; but Miltitz, a sly convivial courtier ; Eck, a vain and bustling disputant ; Aleandro, the nuncio at the Diet of Worms, a literary star, whose life had passed in the thick of the attractions, the display, and the laurels of the *Renaissance* ; Campeggio the lawyer, and others, were men simply cut out on the model of the world of their day. So were Prierias, Emser, Murner, and a whole class of second-rate controversialists. But Luther was obviously not a man of this mould ; his was a powerfully and strikingly religious mind. Whether his religion were a true one or not, he had one ; he lived for its sake ; he was full of it ; it inspired, strengthened, and stimulated him, and made him what he was. He stood before men like a being from another world ; possessed of an intensity of religious belief and ardour to which ordinary men had nothing comparable ; and which the world gazed upon as it does upon any transcendental phenomenon. Out of the whole ecclesiastical corps of the day, not a man was to be found who could meet him on this ground. Everybody knows the great weight and influence of 'signs' in the religious department : people have always sought after signs, and always will. By signs we mean prominent facts or phenomena, which admit of being supposed to be tokens from above, and suggest that supposition to anxious minds. Such signs, though they depend wholly on supposition, more or less natural, and not at all on argument, for their weight, have still often far greater weight than any argument : they belong to the present and the actual ; the immediate manifestation of God's will by a sign is more attractive than that which takes place through the ordinary mediums. And under the head of signs come not only positively miraculous and unaccountable facts, but all striking facts whatever, all appearances, postures of affairs, which admit of having some or other particular signifi-

cance attached to them by the mind. In this sense the absence of religion at the head-quarters of the Church was a serious 'sign' to a large class of religious minds in Luther's days. Luther, on the other hand, was a striking phenomenon of the religious class; an instance of a man possessing, and communicating, the most powerful religious convictions. The religious reason thus came in, and Luther gained numbers on the ground that he seemed to have earnestness on his side, while the Church was worldly and secular. A marvellous combination of the worldly politician and deep religious enthusiast, Luther was confronted by the talent and tact of commonplace men, and he rode over it easily and triumphantly. Legate after legate, and diet after diet broke down before him; they could do nothing; he had it all his own way. He succeeded, for the plain reason that there was not in the whole of Christendom his match, and that the greater man, like the greater momentum, naturally prevails. What, indeed, must have been the prostration of the Church, when in the person of Pope Adrian she humbly, and almost on her knees, implored Erasmus for help against Luther; and the lukewarm indifferentist refused it with the remark, 'I told you what was coming.'

The schism fairly consummated, Luther had now to be the champion and conductor of a declared reformation; to wage war with the Roman Church, and to construct, superintend, and provide for the wants of his own.

The war with Rome was the more easy department to him of the two. The necessity of self-restraint over, and the policy which had hitherto demanded more or less of disguise, now positively directing the most full and broad exposure of the Papacy; such an exposure as would soil and defile the prestige of ages, and accustom men to despise and trample on what they had hitherto revered; he had only to give full swing to his feeling, and let himself be carried away by the force of an at once deliberate and wild impetuosity. The controversial turn of Luther is known. It must be allowed even by his admirers that he flooded the earth with his abuse. As a controversialist, he was literally and wholly without decorum, conscience, taste, or fear. He did not know what it was to hesitate, to waver, upon an epithet or a gibe. There is no appearance in his style of his ever having once in the whole of his controversial career said to himself—Shall I say this or not? He said whatever he liked. He consulted strength alone. If that was to be bought, he refused no price. He was unscrupulously gross and foul-mouthed in his more solid vituperation: in his lighter banter, there was that extremity of insolence which we notice in the derision of a sharp and low crowd at a hustings, choosing exactly,

in their battery upon an obnoxious candidate, the terms and the style the most offensive to his self-respect. A royal and majestic dignity (Henry VIII. of England) engages in theological controversy with Luther, and is thus answered:—‘The Lord Henry, not by the grace of God, King of England, has written in Latin against my treatise. There are some who believe that this pamphlet of the king’s did not emanate from the king’s own pen; but whether Henry wrote, or Hal, or the devil in hell, is nothing to the point. He who lies is a liar. My own notion about the matter is, that Henry gave out an ell or two of coarse cloth, and that then this pituitous Thomist, Lee, the follower of the Thomist herd, who in his presumption wrote against Erasmus, took scissors and made a cope of it. If a king of England spits his impudent lies in my face, I have a right in my turn to throw them back down his own throat. If he blasphemes my sacred doctrines, if he casts his filth at the throne of my Monarch, my Christ, he need not be astonished at my defiling in like manner his royal diadem, and proclaiming him, King of England though he be, a liar and a rascal. . . . He thought to himself, Luther is so hunted about, he will have no opportunity of replying to me; I need not fear to throw any thing that comes first to hand in the poor monk’s path. Ah! ah! my worthy Henry! you’ve reckoned without your host in this matter: you’ve had your say, and I’ll have mine. You shall have truths that won’t amuse you at all. I’ll make you smart for your tricks. This excellent Henry accuses me of having written against the Pope out of personal hatred and ill-will; of being snarlish and quarrelsome, backbiting, proud, and so conceited, that I think myself the only man of sense in the world! I ask you, worthy Hal, what has my being conceited, snappish, and cross-grained, supposing I am so, to do with the question? Is the Papacy free from blame, because I am open to it? Is the King of England a wise man because I suppose him to be a fool? Answer me that. . . . What most surprises me is not the ignorance of this Hal of England, not that he understands less about faith and works than a log of wood, but that the devil should trouble himself to make use of this man against me. King Henry justifies the proverb, “Kings and princes are fools.” I shall say very little more about him at present, for I have the Bible to translate, and other important matters to attend to: on some future occasion, God willing, when I shall be more at leisure, I will reply at greater length to this royal driveller of lies and poison. . . . I imagine that he set about his book by way of penance, for his conscience is ever smiting him for having stolen the crown of England, having made way for himself by murdering the last scion of



'the royal line. . . . Hal and the Pope have exactly the same legitimacy: the Pope stole his tiara, as the king his crown, and therefore it is that they are as thick together as two mules in harness.' The rage of the great monarch on being addressed with such unbounded freedom is evidently before the writer's mind here, and acts as his amusement and his stimulus. It is not difficult to see that the writer of such a passage as this was capable of higher flights in the same department,—of stronger, deeper, more passionate, virulent abuse, when it was his humour. 'Come on, pigs that you are, burn me if you dare! I am here to be seized upon,' he addresses the Thomists. 'My ashes shall pursue you after my death, though you throw them to all the winds, into all the seas. Pigs of Thomists! do what you can. Luther will be the bear in your path, the lion in your way. He will pursue you wherever you go, he will present himself incessantly before you, will leave you not a moment's peace or truce, till he has broken your iron head and your brazen front.' Luther always exerted the powers of a *Comus* towards his adversaries.

' Their human countenance,  
The express resemblance of the gods, is changed  
Into some brutish form of wolf or bear,  
Or ounce, or tiger, hog, or bearded goat.'

A series of caricatures exhibited the Pope and his adherents under complex forms of brutishness, in which ass, calf, hog, ox, elephant, griffin, and fish all mingled. The 'Pope-ass and the Monk-calf,' and 'the Papal Sow,' were accompanied with explanations, that no part of the uncomplimentary symbolism might be lost. Nor, while Luther searched earth, air, sea, and sky for epithets, did he despise the commonest; he had even a prevailing bias to them as being the strongest—to one especially above all others—one invested, by universal consent, with a kind of technical and legal precedence. Luther is unsparing in decking his opponents with long ears; 'They've got their ears too long by half, with their hihau! hihau!'—(some critics had reflected on his Bible translation). 'Tell them that Dr. Martin Luther abides by his translation, regarding a Papist and a jackass as one and the same thing.'

But his mere sallies, after all, do not give the true idea of Luther as a vituperator; it is the constant mingling of the vituperative with the subject, whatever it be, in hand—its incorporation with his style—its unwearied and incessant flow, which astonishes; the rush is sometimes stronger, sometimes weaker; but the floodgates are always open, and invectives ever issuing from Luther's mouth. He is perfectly conscious of his own

warmth, and, like a true clever man, has a *rationale* for it. 'I was born,' he says, 'to meet parties and demons hand to hand on the field of battle; therefore my writings are full of war and tempest. I am the rough pioneer who has to prepare the ways and level the road. But the master of arts, Philip (Melancthon) advances calmly and gently; he cultivates and he plants; he sows and he waters joyfully according to the gifts which God has made him.' As he proceeds through the Epistle to the Galatians, he sees a strong resemblance in himself to S. Paul. The Apostle occasionally uses language of strong rebuke: '*Est et nostra castigatio dura et stylus vehemens*,' adds Luther. The Apostle says, 'I would they were cut off that trouble you.' '*Atrocia verba, horribilia fulmina*,' remarks Luther: '*Paulus acerbissime perstringit, acerbe intehitur*:' 'I, too, Martin Luther, *contra Papam volo et debeo sanctâ superbiâ superbire*.' He forgot that, in the first place, S. Paul uses very different language from that of Martin Luther; and in the second, that he uses that language much less frequently than Martin Luther does his. The comparison overlooks entirely what is an important feature in the case, the question of quantity. S. Paul does not anathematize false prophets in every verse of his Epistles; and an epithet of rebuke once in an Epistle, is not a precedent for an epithet of abuse many times over in a page.

The truth is—though such an explanation is no excuse—faults of temper are the natural faults accompanying strong powers of action. Luther could not have done what he did, if he had not been constitutionally endowed with powers of action in the most wonderful degree: and to possess these powers was to possess a never-failing stimulus to temper. Action of all kinds is connected with, and depends more or less on, the element of passion in the human mind. That necessary state of desire in the mind which all action supposes, in order to account for itself and explain its own origin, is of the nature of passion: and therefore in literal truth no human being can act at all without some passion in him to make him: he cannot walk or talk, move hand or arm, bend joint or sinew without it; he cannot open the door or shut it, or step from one corner of the room to the other but by means of this element in his nature: and passion is the electric or magnetic power which sets every thing within him in motion, and makes him the acting creature he is. Thus the charms of active bodily exercises, and feats of strength: they satisfy a certain passion of action, as we may call it in our nature, and give it play and vent: the process of climbing, leaping, running up-hill, gives a certain impetus and eagerness in the mind, which would otherwise be in painful

restlessness in consequence of inaction, its proper action and *quietus*. And on this principle, we see the commonest kind of action accompanied with passionate excesses, or what we call temper. Thus few people will remove any obstacle to their motion,—a chair, or stool, or table, with exactly the degree of strength which is, and which they themselves know to be, sufficient to remove it. Some will instantaneously inflict the most extravagant superfluity of removal on the offending obstacle; and most persons will remove it more forcibly and farther off than is necessary: not that it is of the smallest advantage to do so, but simply because the material comes into collision with their powers of action; and those powers are fundamentally connected with a species of irascibility. And though such general passion as lies at the bottom of all human action hardly deserves the name, and is an animal rather than a distinctly human impulse—the blind substratum rather than the thing itself—its quality rises with the quality of the action with which it is connected, till it becomes true human passion. Such passion, as connected with power of action, appears remarkably in the characters of the world's great men. It comes out, indeed, often in their case in forms so frightful and extreme that we cease to connect it with such general powers, and regard it as a distinct disease; but it plainly is connected with these powers, and we see that, but for that natural strength of passion of which these horrible excesses were the corruptions and embrutements, these men never could have been the great men they were. The Sylla who decimated Athens because an Athenian wit had passed a joke on his physiognomy, and who on his death-bed saw Granius strangled before his eyes, was the Sylla of the Mithridatic and Social Wars, and the reformer of the Republic. He wrote his own epitaph correctly—'Here lies Sylla, who was 'never outdone in kindness by a friend, or revenge by an 'enemy:' that is to say, here lies a man of intense passions. Who cannot see a connexion between the future Napoleon and the boy who vomited with rage on hearing a reflection passed upon his native Corsica? The strong powers of command and arrangement which such men must have, to be what they are, and bend minds and circumstances as they do, require passion to sustain them, as a tree requires sap. Even our thinking powers require this support, in a way; and the most purely intellectual processes, as soon as ever they become deep and difficult, cannot be carried on without a force of will, which latent passion supplies. All things within and without seem to be ever trying to throw off the empire of mind over them: events get out of control, ideas get out of control; affairs will put themselves, as if from sheer malice, in the most inconvenient and

awkward posture, every thing happening when it ought not, and clashing with every thing else; thoughts fly off, disperse, and refuse to be brought to any head; and the mind has to bring all into order by means of a certain natural force of will or passion.

‘Luctantes ventos tempestatesque sonoras  
Imperio premit.’

Even passion itself must be subdued by passion; and feelings, as they swell into excess, be put down by a forcible antagonist will, which comes from the heart and is in a sense passionate. All strong energetic action having such an internal accompaniment, the consequence is what was to be expected, viz., that from the lowest up to the highest examples of energy, from the energetic man who fells timber or mows grass to the energetic man who rules a nation, as sure as we hear of energy, almost as surely we hear of temper. Industrious and cross, idle and good-tempered, is the housekeeper's experience of servants. Raise the dignity of the epithets, and the same experience applies to higher agents in the world's system. The energetic statesman, ecclesiastic, artist, merchant, poet, is exceedingly apt to be a man of temper. The wide prevalence of the combination is of course no excuse for it; for it only shows that the passionate element in the human constitution tends to excess, and that where there is a strong temptation in a particular direction, the majority will yield to it. Christian principle suggests, that where energy really interferes with Christian temper, the former should give way to the latter. It is of more importance to a man that his temper should be Christian, than that he should govern a party, a nation, a church, or a world. And if he finds himself embarked on a line which necessarily demands a too great amount of energy for him,—if the multitude of his occupations, and the despatch with which he has to go through them, and the interruptions which harass, and the intensity of thought and action which excites him, are too severe a trial to his gentleness and patience, and the result is that he becomes proud and overbearing; a charitable judge will make the proper allowance; but it must still be remembered, that he is responsible for the issue of his situation upon himself; more especially since, in nine cases out of ten, he put himself into it.

Luther had enormous activities, and had that strong passion which goes along with them: and he was lifted by himself, in connexion with events, into a position which demanded the constant support which the whole strength of his nature could give. He had a whole cause to push, maintain, and support,—a whole world to oppose. His strength carried him through his work,

and he gave it in reward all the indulgence which it could possibly demand. The war in which he was engaged was controversial,—a war in which words and not swords carried the day. The strength of his nature, consequently, was developed in the shape of words. His fertility and ready wit gave him peculiar command over this field. Nature gives horns to bulls, and hoofs to horses; to Luther she gave a tongue. The word always came immediately as it was wanted, and impetus suffering no check went on till strength had become coarseness, and coarseness indecency. Such a passionate temperament, with such a ready weapon, hit everybody that came within reach. There was quite enough for Luther in the simple fact that a man was a theological antagonist, to provoke a strong epithet. The disgust which high-mindedness feels instantaneously toward anything which stands in its way, as if nothing visible or invisible, human or divine, had any right to oppose it, inflicted its contumely by instinct almost before it was aware of its own act:—‘Why do you oppose me?—take that!’ Frederic of Prussia carried a cane, with which he vented a perpetual supply of abstract and causeless indignation upon the backs of his officers. Luther, in addition to a temperament, had also a motive; he was the leader of a cause. The storm of nature drove on with the directness of intention, and knocked down every obstacle in the one line of its own motion.

The internal conduct and direction of his own movement was a more difficult and anxious task. It is easier to pull down than to build up in religion; to attack than to construct and maintain. Luther had a completely new ground, both doctrinal and ecclesiastical, to make; he had a new doctrine, the Lutheran dogma of justification by faith, to propagate and transmit to posterity; he had a new society to form, which was to be the keeper and transmitter of it. It was absolutely necessary to construct a whole new system, internal and external, doctrinal and corporate—that is to say, a new Church.

To enable himself to construct a new Church, a theory in the first instance was necessary, and a new theory. And, accordingly, a formal theory is laid in Luther’s works for this purpose—the theory now so familiar to us, viz. that every baptized person is a priest. As a priesthood makes sacraments, and sacraments make a Church, this theory at once supplied Luther with the power of making a Church. Baptism was all he wanted; and baptism he had. Every baptized person could, as far as principle went, administer the sacraments, and perform all the offices of a priest. What members of the baptized body should perform such offices was, indeed, a grave question of external order; and the founder of a Church was obliged to

secure order. He could only secure order by authority, and therefore he had to fix upon some authority. But the only authority he wanted was one for this external purpose; and such an authority seemed ready made for him in the State. He made the State this authority, and the whole question was settled. This theory, however, seldom makes its appearance in formal shape in Luther's works, and is more commonly implied than expressed. It was practically the only kind of Church he could found, if he was to found one at all. The question was settled for him by circumstances, and he let circumstances settle it for him: he had kings on his side, and he had no bishops. The great doctrine he had to promulgate, in short, created its own Church, and sanctioned its own priesthood and sacraments. If it was true, there must be some way of preserving and transmitting it; and that way could be only the establishment of a Church. A society is the natural keeper of an idea, and Luther, full of the truth of his own idea of justification, of which he considered himself the all but inspired teacher, made a society in what way he could. The established channels of Ordination, the Episcopacy, the Apostolical Succession, a whole system of external Church appointments, which was coeval with Christianity, went for nothing, in comparison with the necessities of a new doctrine demanding some mode of establishing and transmitting itself. If Luther had had an Episcopacy ready to hand, and ready to go along with him, he would not have rejected it; but as he had not got it, he did without it. The new Lutheran Church rose up because the Lutheran doctrine wanted it, and appealed to no other sanction or right.

But Luther, in establishing his new society, with its form of worship, prayers, ceremonial, and whole external system, proceeded with that caution and accommodating spirit which have been already noticed in him. His great maxim was, that the doctrine would create its own proper worship and its own externals. He therefore gave himself no trouble to put down the actual ceremonial forms themselves which were established, and used no violence. Preach my doctrine, he said; that will do more than any direct attack upon such things can do; that must and will undermine all the established ceremonial and external system, if it only continues to be preached; that is worth all the force and battery in the world. Thus the mass went on, the same vestments continued to be used, the images still stood, and the whole interior of the church fabric remained as before. 'You ask me for a form of celebrating mass,' he writes to Spalatin. 'I entreat you to trouble me no more about these minutiae; let the conscience be kept quite free on the subject. It is by no means a thing of such importance as that, on its account, we should chain



'down the spirit of liberty with additional rules, regulations, and traditions. We have enough of them and to spare.' Later, *i. e.* in 1526, he writes, 'The mass is celebrated with the accustomed rites and in the same costume as formerly, the only difference is that we sing some hymns in German, and that the words of consecration are in German. Indeed, I should not have abolished the Latin mass at all, or have substituted the vernacular, had I not found myself compelled to do so.' 'If you have not already abolished the Latin mass,' he writes to a minister, 'do not abolish it, but merely introduce into it a few German hymns. If it be abolished, at all events retain the old order and costumes.' The adoration of saints he would not forbid: 'Let each follow his own interpretation of such matters. Truth and charity forbid men to dispute and also arbitrarily condemn one another, for faith and charity hate sects and schisms. I would resolve the question of the adoration of God in the saints by saying that it is a thing entirely free and indifferent.' On the subject of relics he would only say, 'I believe the whole collection of them has been already quite enough exhibited.' Purgatory, he thought, 'was very uncertain.' Confession was 'a good thing.' There was no harm in keeping festivals or going pilgrimages. 'Ceremonies are not necessary to salvation,' he said, 'yet they produce an effect upon rude and uncultivated minds.' 'I condemn no ceremony which is not contrary to the Gospel.' 'You are about to organize the church at Kœnisberg,' he writes to a pastor, 'I entreat you, in the name of Christ, to make as few changes as possible. You have in your neighbourhood several Episcopal towns, and it is not desirable that the ceremonies of our new Church should vary in any marked degree from the old ritual.' Even with respect to monasteries and nunneries, for which he had such deep aversion, he took and countenanced no violent steps. Only voluntary desertion was encouraged, and not that in all cases. 'I would not advise persons advanced in age to quit the cloister, because returning helpless to the world they would necessarily become a charge to other people, and would scarcely meet in these uncharitable days with the care and attention to which their age is entitled. In the interior of the monastery they are a burden to no one; and, moreover, they are in a position to do a great deal in aid of the spiritual salvation of their neighbours, which, were they in the world, it would be difficult, nay, I will almost say, impossible for them to do.' Of another case, 'We should leave poor nuns like these to live on after their own fashion.' Such was the cautious and dilatory line on which Luther had determined, and to which, notwithstanding the perpetual siege upon it, he adhered. Letters from pastors in all directions, indeed, pressed for immediate deci-

sions on different points of faith and practice; and innumerable tender consciences revolted from this and that part of the established system of worship and ceremonial; of which each wanted an answer from him instantaneous, absolute, and on its own side. One and another pastor was for immediately abolishing either confession, or saint-worship, or images, or the reception of the sacrament in one kind, or pilgrimages, or festivals and fasts. But Luther maintained his qualified position, and adhered obstinately to ambiguities and negatives. He parried the questions; soothed and calmed the questioners; advised quietness and delay, and ended with reiterating the favourite dictum, that all would be certain to come right if *the doctrine* was preached. The magnanimous ease and repose of the great leader of the movement stands out strikingly amid the petty scruples and small activities of the inferior agents; and Luther submits to all these questionings with that half-kind, half-scornful condescension with which dignified persons submit to any bore which their position brings upon them. 'The whole world pestered him,' he said, 'with questions;' but as people would not be satisfied if they had not answers of some kind, he sent them answers: an amiable weakness deserved some indulgence. As for himself, he wanted to put down nothing which his doctrine would allow to stand; and he would let the doctrine find out what could stand with it and what could not. He had no desire to interfere himself in the matter. An easy capacious liberalism objected to the dogmatic enforcement of fasts and feasts, vestments, images, and the like, but so long as they were left voluntary, saw no harm in them. Dogmatism in rejecting, and dogmatism in enforcing, were both condemned; and the spirit of Luther's reformation was in some aspects a remarkable anticipation of that modern Germanism, which is associated amongst ourselves with the name of Dr. Arnold.

But Luther was compelled, like many other teachers, to see a favourite line of policy broken in upon; and, however moderate and procrastinating his own views might be, a crowd of troublesome followers were not to be wholly coerced. He had the pain of seeing, one after another, various tendencies in the Reformation prematurely brought out and exhibited in exaggerated shape, and with accompaniments of violence and horror, before the world. Carlstadt and the image-breakers of Wittenberg, Munzer and the fanatic revolutionist peasants of Thuringia, John of Leyden and the Anabaptists, diverted the Reformation from its regular and orderly course, and disgraced it by monstrous associations.

Luther was in the benevolent confinement of the castle of Wartburg, where his friend the Elector Frederick had placed

him after the Diet of Worms, when he heard of the iconoclast excesses of Carlstadt and his party at Wittenberg. In addition to the evil itself of such excesses, the fact that a vain, shallow, noisy man should be taking advantage of his absence to assume a lead, and gratify his own envy for his superior—for that motive was deep in Carlstadt's mind—provoked and roused him. He first wrote letters to the Wittenbergers:—'You have rushed into your present proceedings, eyes shut, head down like a bull. Reckon no longer on me; I cast you off; I abjure you. You began without me; finish how you may.' His letters producing no effect, he determined to see what his personal presence would do. The monastic gown laid aside, and the steel cuirass, long heavy sword, plumed casque, and spurs and boots of a man at arms assumed, he escaped from Wartburg, and suddenly, amidst a crowd of valets and a cloud of dust, as Lucas Cranach has painted him, made his appearance in the streets of Wittenberg. His next step was to enter the church, (which, strewn with the fragmentary blocks of the old statuary, like a mason's shop, gave ocular witness to the late excesses,) and ascend the pulpit. The Wittenbergers now *en masse* before him, he scolded them like boys:—'Satan,' he commenced, 'has been busy in my absence, and sent you some of his prophets. He knows whom to send; but you ought to know, too, that I am the only person you should listen to. Martin Luther is the first man of the Reformation: others come after him; he, therefore, should command, and you should obey. It is your lot. I am the man to whom God has revealed His word. I know Satan, and am not afraid of him; I have hit him a blow which he will feel a long time.' Carlstadt was in church during this discourse, but hid himself behind a pillar to avoid Luther's eye. He and his fellow-prophets, Munzer, Stubner, and others, made their retreat, and left Luther in possession of the field.

In another quarter, the Peasant Sedition gave Luther much annoyance. The peasant population of Thuringia, of the Palatinate, of the Dioceses of Mayence, Halberstadt, and Odenwald, had long murmured under the weight of their servitude, and the various exactions and oppressions, petty and great, of the nobles. They took advantage now of the reforming movement to rise in arms and assert their rights. Under the leadership of Goetz, '*with the Iron Hand*,' and George Metzler, they assembled in the Black Forest, got possession of Mergentheim, and compelled several counts, barons, and knights to join them. The subjects of the powerful Count of Hohenlohe were soon added; the Count himself being compelled to sign a treaty with the insurgents for a hundred years. The town of Landau, and the environs of

Heibroam rose. The body got reinforcements daily, and town after town opened their gates to them. Agents from the main army dispersed through the several districts, received oaths of adhesion, and imposed tribute—the clergy of Mayence paying in a fortnight fifteen thousand gold florins. A mixture of religious and political fanaticism formed the basis of this revolutionary movement. The insurgents marched under the banner of a white cross, and to the music of the Marseillaise hymns of the day. As soon as their body was compacted, and scheme formed, a public statement, divided into the well-known Twelve Articles, set forth their grievances and their rights. They demanded the free election of their pastors, relief from various feudal exactions, and, last of all, release from slavery and villanage; and they appealed to Luther to sanction and support their claims. Luther answered their appeal, and undertook the task of mediation. He published an ‘Exhortation to Peace,’ in which he divided himself nearly equally between the two contending sides. He rebuked the nobles for their rapacity and oppression, and the peasants for their insubordination and licence. To the former he said: ‘It is quite clear that you have no one upon earth to thank for all this disorder but you yourselves, princes and lords;—it is you and your crimes God is about to punish. If the peasants who are now attacking you are not the ministers of His will, others coming after them will be so. You may beat them, but you will be none the less vanquished; you may crush them to the earth, but God will raise up others in their place: it is His pleasure to strike you, and He will strike you.’ To the latter he said: ‘Authority is unjust, but you are more in the wrong even than authority; you who, not content with interdicting the Word of God, trample it under foot, and arrogate to yourselves the power reserved to God alone.’ And he repelled, by Scripture arguments, their claim to release from villanage: ‘You wish to apply to the flesh the Christian liberty taught by the Gospel, but I would ask you, did not Abraham and the other patriarchs, as well as the prophets, keep bondmen? S. Paul himself tells us, that the empire of this world cannot subsist without an inequality of persons.’

Thus far the position of the insurgents was a respectable one, and Luther gave them a modified support. But a body of insurgent peasants could not keep up its respectability long. It fell soon into the fanatical leadership of Munzer, and plunged into frightful atrocities. Under the watchword of ‘No quarter to idle men,’ they massacred all the nobles who fell into their hands; in Franconia alone they pillaged and burned two hundred and ninety-three monasteries; and their revolutionary

theory, grown monstrous, demanded the universal levelling of social ranks. Luther saw immediately that he could not afford to mix up his cause with such a cause as theirs now was, and he threw them off with characteristic decision. 'Miserable spirits of confusion! no mercy, no toleration is due to the peasants; on them should fall the wrath of God and of man; the peasants are under the ban of God and of the Emperor, and may be treated as mad dogs.' In the event, the peasants were massacred wholesale, Luther actually hounding on the nobles to the work.

It is not surprising that Luther's conduct in this matter should have encountered criticism, and that the observation should be made, that he favoured the peasants at first and bitterly denounced them afterwards. While we see in his conduct here, however, the natural vehemence of his character, and unscrupulous summariness of his policy, we cannot, with M. Audin, accuse him of inconsistency. His favour to the peasants at first was favour coupled with advice. If they neglected his advice, the favour was not obliged to last. He told them to be moderate, and meet their masters half way: they took to massacring and levelling. As soon as he saw this, he had done with them. Had they put themselves under his guidance, he would have made use of them, and stood up for them. But as they chose to be their own masters, and behave senselessly, he said: Miscreants, you are injuring my cause, and I will rid myself of you as soon as possible. And, as Luther never did any thing by halves, his form of throwing them off was, calling for their massacre. For this form he is responsible, but we see no inconsistency in the line of conduct. M. Audin regards Luther as a sympathizer with political fanaticism in the first instance, and, when he saw the results, then turning round upon the actors whom his sympathies had encouraged. But this was not the case. Luther never had any sympathy with levellers; he gave no encouragement to the peasants to become political fanatics. He had strong sympathies with regular monarchical and aristocratic power; and from the first he strongly advised the peasants, while they claimed freedom from particular oppressions and exactions, to submit quietly to remain in their established servile state. M. Audin makes two separate addresses of Luther's to the peasants, of which the popularly-toned one he dates before, the aristocratically-toned one after, the excesses of the peasant war; and hence accuses Luther of changing sides with events; but these two were not separate addresses, but only two parts of one and the same address, qualifying and balancing each other.

But Luther's bitterest vexations were the doctrinal developments which the Reformation now began to show in some

quarters. A hard sceptical materialist spirit, not content with the freedom from the law of works which he had achieved, began to empty and dry up the channels of grace. The Anabaptists under Carlstadt, and still more fanatical prophets than he, attacked the sacrament of Baptism; the Swiss under Zwinglius, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The former denied infant-baptism,—a denial involving a rationalistic theory of that sacrament, and converting it into an imposing rite for impressing the mature intellect. The latter directly rationalized away the mystery of the Eucharist, converting it into a simple memorial and symbol. Luther denounced these manifestations, and whenever he could persecuted the movers. Carlstadt, already driven from Wittemberg, was soon again driven from Orlamund, whither he had retired next; and then soon driven from Jena, whither he had retired next. Luther drove him from place to place, and, apparently forgetting that the unfortunate man, if he lived at all, must live somewhere, barricaded one town against his entrance just as he fastened the gates of another upon his departure. The issues of the prolific presses of Jena were stopped at the shop-door by the Elector's officers: 'It was not to be endured,' said Luther, 'that Carlstadt and his people should be alone permitted to emancipate themselves from due submission to authorities.' The author attempted to fix at Schweindorf, but Count Henneberg instructed the town council not to admit him for an hour. He was at last allowed the tether of two little villages near Wittemberg, where he and his wife lived by manual labour, one digging, and the other crying cakes. One attempt to reassume the black gown then banished him from Saxony altogether, and he took refuge in Switzerland. '*Fanatici spiritus*'—'Celestial prophets,' were Luther's terms for all this tribe of theologians: whatever the particular subject in hand may be, at every turn in his controversial writings and commentaries, the 'fanatic spirits' get a rebuke. Disdain of the men never subdued his sense of their mischievousness; and irony mixed with irritation in all his allusions to them. Seldom condescending to argue, he asked them at once for the miracles by which they proved their new revelation, and not having this demand answered, dismissed them. In the well-known interview at which the two theologians defied each other, Carlstadt, always aping Luther, cannot meet the swing of Luther's careless contempt: *he* threatens, and Luther laughs. 'I will write against you,' says the former. 'Write away,' says the latter, 'here is a florin for you, if you do it well.' Luther's disputation with the corporation of Orlamund is in the same style. The burgomaster, accompanied by the magistrates,



received Luther at the gate with compliments; Luther barely saluted them with an inclination of the head. The burgomaster commenced an address, and Luther told him he had no time to hear him. They proceeded to the hall of conference, where all the people of the town were assembled in a state of the utmost excitement. A man out of the crowd began to shout. 'A prophet,' says Luther, 'by his voice; I know them all; your eyes, my friend, are like two hot coals, but they will not burn me.' The first of the proposed arguments, of which the subject was the lawfulness of images, then began, which ended thus: a cobbler of Orlamund *loquitur*:—"The text of Deuteronomy is 'clear; "Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female—" Luther, 'Go on.' "And lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, should be drawn to worship them." Luther, 'So, then, you would take the sun and the moon out of the creation?' Cobbler, 'The sun and moon were not made by us.' Luther, 'Well, then, you condemn me, do you?' Cobbler, 'Certainly: you, and all who do not preach God's word.' Luther, mounting his carriage, 'Farewell, then.' All the corporation—"What! not one word with you on the Sacraments?" Luther, 'Read my books.'

But the rising rationalistic view of the Lord's Supper was Luther's great trouble, as he surveyed the working of the Reformation; and Zwinglius was the great thorn in his side. In him he saw an undeniably able rival; stern, strong, and hard as a flint; who threatened to wrench the Reformation out of his grasp, carry it in another direction from that in which it had started, and infuse a different spirit into it to that which its original author had given.

The strong faith and reverence which Luther always professed with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the pertinacity with which he clung to the idea of mystery and grace in connexion with it, the awe in which he stood of the inspired words of institution, and constant vindication of their obvious and full meaning for them, form a remarkable, and at first sight not very intelligible contrast with his perfectly free-and-easy treatment of Scripture when he comes across it on another great subject. On the subject of the Lord's Supper the sacred text chained and overpowered him: he professed that he could not get over the words, 'This is My body,' 'This is My blood,' and dare not trifle with them. They confronted him on the page of Scripture, and he submitted to them. He said he had tried to get over them, but found he could not; that they had stood in his way, and that he would have

been too glad to have explained them away, if he had not on approaching them, found them too strong for him; that the tempter had especially assailed him on this point, and had not moved him. 'I confess,' he says, 'that if any had shown me five years ago, that, in the holy sacrament there is nothing but bread and wine, he would have rendered me a great service. I had at that time powerful temptations assailing me; I turned and twisted about; I struggled fiercely with my own thoughts; I should have been most joyful to have extricated myself from the doubts and difficulties which surrounded me. I saw well, that if I could have made up my mind on that point, I should inflict a most terrible blow on Papism. But, upon this matter, I am chained up in a prison I cannot quit: the text is too powerful; nothing I have ever heard has lessened its effects upon my mind.' Such was Luther's scrupulousness with respect to the text of Scripture on this subject, his adherence to obvious signification, and dislike of explanation. But it was very different when he had to support his doctrine of justification by faith and the non-necessity of works. There was no liberty then which he was not ready to take with the sacred text. He found the New Testament in every page appealing to a law which he declared the New Testament had abolished; and he explained Scripture away on as large and wholesale a scale as the extent of the obstacles demanded. He laid down a distinction between being *in* the Gospel, and being part of the Gospel. The Gospel had precepts in it which were not part of it, but only appendages to it. 'Quæ præcepta in Evangelio inveniuntur, ista non sunt Evangelium, sed expositiones legis et appendices Evangelii.' The Gospel contained precepts just as it contained miracles, not as essential to its system, but only as an accidental accompaniment of its institution. 'Non est proprium Christi officium, propter quod præcipue venit in mundum, docere legem, sed accidentale. Cujusmodi erat et hoc quod sanabat infirmos, excitabat mortuos, benefaciebat indignos, consolabatur afflictos. Ea quidem gloriosa et divina opera et beneficia sunt, sed non propria Christi.'<sup>1</sup> Luther, like an expert chemist, thus analyzed the rude material of the Gospel, and discriminated between what was substantial

<sup>1</sup> It will be observed that the argument here is not stated strongly enough for Luther's conclusion; for it is not enough for proving that precepts are not a substantial part of the Gospel, to say that they are not *propria*, i.e. the peculiar and exclusive characteristic of it. Nobody asserts that the law is the peculiar characteristic of the new dispensation; all that is maintained is, that the law goes on under it, as well as under the old one, and is not done away with. Luther's *non-propria*, then, must be strengthened into a stronger epithet, and be understood to mean not essential to, as well as not peculiar to it, if the argument is to be consistent.

in it, and what was not; what was genuine Gospel, and what was the old law, introduced, but not incorporated. When pushed another step in the argument, and asked to *account* for the introduction of the law, if it was *not* part of the system, he had a further explanation ready. There was, he confessed, a whole legal machinery in the Gospel; good works being commanded, and reward and punishment being made dependent on the performance; but this machinery was only a contrivance on the part of the Gospel to expose ultimately, with so much greater force, the emptiness of works. It was said, indeed, if you do the work, you will have the reward; but that 'if' was not a promissory, but a defying one: its meaning was, You will not do the work, and you will not deserve the reward; you will find that your labour is vain, and your work nothing. 'The what, and the 'how, of the reward,' says Luther, 'are not the question; the 'question is whether you can do the thing for which the reward is offered.' '*Homo præcepto impossibili monetur, ut videat suam impotentiam.*' In this way the whole system of law and precept which confronts us on the very surface of Scripture, was reduced, by a method of esoteric interpretation, into a mere husk and outside; the external fabric of the deeper truth that there was no law. The surface was for the natural man, the truth was for the believer. The Gospel language was only a pious fraud, and the issue showed the real meaning; just as when in some puzzle or piece of legerdemain the reality turns out to be the very contrary of the phenomenon.

Having up to a certain point contented himself with explaining away Scripture, Luther now advanced farther, and proceeded to disown Scripture. The Epistle of S. James, though opposing no insurmountable difficulties to the free interpreter,—as what language does?—was still a very difficult epistle to surmount: it was questionable whether the violence which would be necessary for its explanation would be greater than that of rejecting the epistle altogether; and Luther, hesitating a good deal between the two methods of dealing with it, inclines on the whole to the latter. He gives his view in his preface to the Epistles of S. James and S. Jude:<sup>1</sup>—

'1. This Epistle of S. James, though it is rejected by the ancients, I praise and hold to be good, because it advances not any human doctrine, and urges strongly the law of God. But to give my own opinion of it, without prejudice to any other man's, I consider it to be the production of no apostle, and this is my judgment:

'2. In the first place, because, directly contrary to St. Paul and to all the rest of the Scripture, it ascribes righteousness to works, and says: *Abra-*

<sup>1</sup> Luther's Works, ed. Walche, Halle, A.D. 1744, vol. xiv. p. 149; Preface to the Epistles of S. James and S. Jude.

*ham was justified by his works, when he had offered his son*; while S. Paul (Rom. iv. 2, 3) teaches, on the contrary, that Abraham without works was justified by his faith only, and proves from Moses (Gen. xv. 6,) that justification to have been before he had offered his son. Now, even though it were possible to bolster up this Epistle, and find some gloss for such justification by works, still it cannot be defended in this, that in ch. ii. 23, it quotes the aforesaid passage from Moses (Gen. xv. 6,) which speaks of Abraham's faith only, and not of his works, and is so quoted by S. Paul (Rom. iv. 3), as referring to works. Therefore this error is conclusive that it is the work of no apostle.

'3. In the second place, because, while he professes to be teaching Christian people, he never once thinks, in all the length of that his instruction, of the Passion, the Resurrection, or the Spirit of Christ. He names Christ, indeed, now and then; but he teaches not about him, but speaks only of a general faith in God. For the duty of a true apostle is to preach of the Passion, and Resurrection, and Office of Christ, and to lay the foundation of that same faith, as He Himself says, John xv. 27, *Ye shall bear witness of me*. And herein all the holy books that are truly such do agree, that they all with one accord preach and urge Christ. And this is the true touchstone wherewith to convict all books, the seeing whether they urge Christ or no, since all the Scripture points to Christ (Rom. iii. 21,) and S. Paul will *know nothing but Christ* (1 Cor. ii. 2). Whatsoever teaches not Christ, that is not apostolical, even though S. Peter or S. Paul taught it. On the other hand, whatever preaches Christ, that is apostolical, though it were Judas, Ananias, Pilate, and Herod's work.

'4. But this James does nothing more than insist on the law and its works, and rings the changes upon them to such excess, that it gives me the impression he must have been some good pious man, who had got hold of some sentences from the disciples of the apostles, and so put them on paper. Or it may have been perhaps written from his preaching by some one else. He calls (ch. i. 25) the law a *law of liberty*, while S. Paul, on the contrary, calls it a *law of bondage, of wrath, of death, and of sin*. (Gal. iii. 23, 24; Rom. vii. 11, 23.)

'5. Besides, he introduces texts from S. Peter (1 Pet. iv. 8), *Charity covereth a multitude of sins*; and (ch. v. 16), *Humble yourselves under the hand of God*; also (ch. iv. 5) a text from S. Paul (Gal. v. 17), *The spirit lusteth to envy*. Moreover, its spuriousness appears plainly from this, that while S. James in point of chronology was slain by Herod at Jerusalem before Peter, this author must have lived long after S. Peter and S. Paul.

'6. Upon the whole, he undertakes to put down all those who trusted to faith without works, and he is unequal to his task: he seeks to effect that by inculcation of the law which the apostles effect by incentives to love. For these reasons I cannot place him among the genuine canonical books; still neither do I gainsay any man to place and value this book as he may list: for otherwise there are in it many good sentences.'

This concluding paragraph runs in the edition of 1522 thus:—

'Upon the whole, he undertakes to put down those who trusted to faith only without works, and he is in spirit, understanding, and language, unequal to his task. He wrests Scripture, and, what is more, contradicts Paul and all the Scriptures, seeking to effect by inculcation of the law that which the apostles effect by incentives to love. For these reasons I will not have him in my Bible in the list of the true canonical books; still neither do I gainsay any man to place and value this book as he may list: for otherwise there are in it many good sentences. One man by himself

is nobody in worldly matters; how, then, shall this writer, who is but one and alone, dare contradict Paul and all the other Scriptures?'<sup>1</sup>

The specimen of Luther's scrupulousness with respect to Scripture, and the specimen of his unscrupulousness now before us, suggest many obvious pieces of criticism: but we shall only

<sup>1</sup> The Preface which we have given is the Preface to the *particular Epistles* of S. James and S. Jude. This is a different and distinct preface from the Preface to the New Testament in general, which comes first of all. In this latter-mentioned Preface occurs the opprobrious epithet of the 'epistle of straw,' by which Luther designated the Epistle of S. James, and for which Archdeacon Hare gives the following apology: 'All sorts of persons complain that Luther called it an *Epistle of straw*; and perhaps the loudest in this complaint are those to whom the whole Bible is little else than a book of straw. The expression, so far as I have been able to discover, occurs only in a part of the Preface to the German New Testament published in 1522, printed by Walch in vol. xiv. p. 105, and was omitted in the editions subsequent to 1524. Luther, in pointing out, for the instruction of those who were unused to the reading of the Bible, which books in the New Testament are of the greatest importance, says, as many have said before and since, that the Gospel of S. John is to be valued far above the other three, and concludes thus: "S. John's Gospel, and his first Epistle, the Epistles of S. Paul, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and S. Peter's first Epistle,—these are the books which set Christ before you, and teach you every thing necessary and salutary for you to know, even though you were never to hear or see any other book or doctrine. Therefore the Epistle of S. James is quite an epistle of straw by the side of these; for it has no true evangelical character." Now, doubtless, if these books were to be severed from the rest of Scripture, it would be much as if you were to cut away the roots and trunk of a tree, and to fancy that the upper branches would still continue hanging in the air, putting forth leaves, and bearing fruit. On the other hand it should be observed that the expression applied to the Epistle of S. James is not used positively, but relatively, in comparison with those books of the New Testament in which the special doctrines of the Gospel are brought forward more fully and explicitly. It was probably suggested by what S. Paul says in 1 Cor. iii. 12; and, as I have often had occasion to remark, Luther's words are not to be weighed in a jeweller's scales. Besides we must take into account that, while he is quite right in denying the specially evangelical character of this Epistle, it had been turned by those who exaggerated and perverted its meaning, into the main prop of those very errors concerning faith and justification, which it was his peculiar mission to overthrow. Even in the quietest controversy we well know how difficult it is to measure all our thoughts and words, not to exaggerate what favours our own side, not to depreciate what supports our adversary. Who, then, will make a man an offender for a word, uttered in the stress of such a conflict, the most awful perhaps ever waged by man, inasmuch as it was not only against an external power which kept the hearts and minds of half Christendom in abject bondage, and answered an argument with a sentence of excommunication and an *auto da fe*, but also in the first instance against the force of his own inveterate habits and prepossessions, nay, of a faith which he had himself long held earnestly and submissively before he detected its fallacy. Nor should it be forgotten that Luther omitted the offensive expression in the later editions of his New Testament.'—*Hare's Mission of the Comforter*, pp. 814—816.

Of this apology of Archdeacon Hare's we have nothing to say, except that it is perhaps as good a one as could be made. The truth is, no apology can be made for such language. Impetuosity and provocation cannot justify the contemptuous treatment of an inspired book of Scripture; nor should Archdeacon Hare suppose that by accounting for such an act, he goes any way to excuse it. Some or other impulse or motive accounts for every wrong act; but the act is not at all excused in consequence. We will add, that whatever may have become of the offensive epithet, 'epistle of straw,' in subsequent editions (and if Luther left it out, let the

ask here, why was he so scrupulous in one case, so unscrupulous in another? Luther's modes of proceeding seldom require very nice criticism to explain. He was very scrupulous with respect to Scripture when it interposed against another man's dogma; very unscrupulous with respect to it when it interfered with his own. Justification without works was his own dogma; the Sacramentarian view of the Lord's Supper was Zwinglius's. Luther had his own great absorbing idea; he was prepared to push that out at all risk, and Scripture text and Scripture canon gave way before it. But he cared marvellously little about other men's new ideas, and thought it rather an impertinence that they should have them at all. He was then magisterial, and assumed the chair of the *doctor ecclesiae*. He took the bold originator severely to task, confronted him with the Scripture

---

omission be taken into account,) the Preface which we have quoted appears in Walche's edition of Luther's works (1744,) without any sign whatever of abandonment by its author, or any intimation of its belonging only to a prior edition of Luther's works, as distinct from a later one. The Preface, therefore, we have given represents Luther's permanent opinions with respect to the Epistle of S. James.

Luther is generally defended from the sin of his attacks on the canon of Scripture on the ground that he modified his views afterward. But the modifications were comparatively slight, and never amounted to retractations. There were four Epistles of which he denied the inspiration: the Second Epistle of S. Peter, the Epistles of S. James and S. Jude, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, to which must be added the Book of Revelation. In the case of each of these, the reasons he assigns are sometimes very frivolous, and always simple opinions of his own upon the doctrine and style of the Epistle or Book he rejects. He sits in criticism upon Scripture; and if he thinks an Epistle evangelical, admits it; if not, rejects it. The text ch. x. ver. 26 of the Epistle to the Hebrews—'If we sin wilfully 'after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more 'sacrifice for sins'—offended him, and influenced him in his rejection of the Epistle. He also did not like to think that Esau 'found no place for repentance;' and that influenced him. The Revelation, again, was too full of visions in his opinion—it was 'through and through with figures;' he did not like this, and thought an apostle would not prophesy in such a way. Again, the writer of the Book of Revelations seemed to him to threaten too severely all those who 'shall add unto,' or 'shall take away from the words of the book:' 'whereas,' observes Luther, with easy levity, 'nobody knows what is in this book.' 'Let each man,' he says, 'judge of this book according to the light that is in him, and by his own 'particular perceptions. I do not desire to impose my opinion respecting it upon any 'one. I say simply that which I think of it myself. I look upon the Revelation 'of S. John to be neither apostolic nor prophetic.' Again of the same book, 'Many of the Fathers of the Church rejected this book; consequently every man is 'at liberty to treat it according to the dictates of his own mind. For my part, 'one single reason has determined me in the judgment I have come to respecting 'it, which is, that Christ is neither adored in it, nor taught in it such as we know 'Him.' In all these cases Walche is anxious to bring out all he can to prove that Luther changed his mind afterward; but he does not *profess* to show more than that his style is here and there subdued. Luther never altered the substance of his view, or *admitted* any of these regularly into the canon again; though, in the case of the Book of Revelations, he cancelled the whole of his old preface, and substituted a new one. He continued to reject all for himself, only saying that he did not wish to interfere with any other person's acceptance of them.



letter, protested against all liberties, was angry, scandalized, and shocked. It is but justice to add that Luther had, independently of this consideration, small sympathies with such a view as Zwinglius's. Luther hated formality in religion, but he had no objection to mystery. His whole view against works was antagonistic to form and rule, precision and positiveness in duties. But with mystery he had sympathies; his love of the supernatural in the region of common life, his ghost and fairy lore, the very grotesquenesses into which his supernaturalism ran, showed a mind possessed of the sense of mystery. The Swiss development of the Reformation, cold, hard, dry, and materialistic, repelled and disgusted him; he denounced its distinctive doctrine as a gratuitous and audacious innovation; and he proceeded to call Zwinglius names. 'What a fellow is this Zwinglius! ignorant, as a block, of grammar, and logic, and every other science.' 'Zwinglius I regard as having drawn upon himself the just hatred of all good men by his daring and criminal manner of treating the word of God.' With Zwinglius, Bucer went along. 'I know, too well, the wickedness of Bucer . . . Christ guard thee, poor Luther, surrounded as thou art with these wild beasts, these vipers, lionesses, and panthers; far more in danger than was Daniel in the lions' den.'

There was another subject on which the Reformation began to show uncomfortable signs, and threaten dangerous developments: we allude to the subject of marriage. On this subject, indeed, Luther had himself established large premisses for license to appeal to.

Luther had a fundamental view with respect to marriage, conceived, as many other of his views were, in the spirit of one-sided and impatient contradiction to established ideas. That the abuses of the monastic system were great, and that force and tyranny in those ages drove numbers of both sexes into monasteries and convents, who were not at all fitted for the life, and who were deprived by such an incarceration of that development, moral and intellectual, of themselves which God had intended for them, nobody can fairly doubt. The story of the nun in the 'I Promessi Sposi' is only a specimen of what went on, on a large scale. There was a general wide-spread grievance; and it was a plain fact, that the Divine institution of marriage was unlawfully interfered with by human systems. To expose such a grievance, and obtain a remedy for it, was in itself a legitimate task for any one to undertake. But Luther undertook it in that extravagant and excessive spirit in which he undertook every other work. He opposed a practical grievance in one direction by an extreme theory in another, and set

up a code which was new to the Christian world. He seems to have regarded himself as under a special prophetic commission to revive the original matrimonial charter given to the human race; and he set about his work with the spirit with which a political revolutionist goes back to his theory of the social compact. He overlooked the qualifications, cautions, and exceptions with which to us, under the Christian dispensation, this charter comes down accompanied; and that whole department of Christian precept, which, however much abused, was in itself a Divine modification, interpreting the original law to us, just as subsequent judgments interpret original statutes in civil courts, was entirely thrown over to make way for a naked reassertion of the original law itself. With his usual decision and point, Luther threw himself upon the original command in the 28th verse of the 1st chapter of Genesis: '*Crescite et multiplicamini.*' In this sentence he saw the whole of the Divine law, advice, and recommendation on the subject of marriage collected. Here, he said, is a universal command or statute, under the action of which the whole human race comes. It is quite evident, therefore, that everybody is intended to marry, and that everybody should marry. Nobody has a right to resist the law of God, and oppose himself to the original act of creation. To this universal law, indeed, Luther did admit nominally exceptions; he was obliged nominally to allow the force of the text in the 19th chapter of S. Matthew: but he loaded the text with such restrictions, and compelled everybody, who stood upon it, to give such demonstrable reasons that he was of the particular class which the text singled out; that practically his theory amounted to a universal and essential obligation. In accordance with this new speculative movement, society was, with respect to the general rules and regulations of marriage, thrown back upon the Old Testament code, as distinguished from the subsequent legislation of the New. The temper of a sterner and purer dispensation disregarded, the forbidden degrees were largely thrown open. Luther countenanced even more flagrant violations of the Christian code; and his Sermon *de Matrimonio*, delivered at Wittenberg in the year 1522, gives licences from which the natural conscience of a heathen and a savage would recoil. Without dwelling, however, on these special extravagances, it is sufficient to remark, that the whole of the matrimonial question was stirred up from its basis again, and that, an established system of Christian growth removed, the field was opened anew for the indefinite play of speculation and practice. There was an open area; a new code was invited, and the original statute, '*Crescite et multiplicamini,*' was the axiom appealed to.

That such a theoretical movement on the subject of marriage should produce some awkward practical fruits, was not surprising. So fierce and naked an appeal to original rights was likely to set men speculating very freely and largely as to what their rights were. It was not surprising if, amid the clearance of established ideas, a certain Elector Philip of Hesse began to imagine that there would be no great harm in having two wives. The appeal had been made to the old dispensation; and under the old dispensation a plurality of wives was allowed. Philip described his case as a very strong one, and supplicated earnestly.

Now it is obvious that as soon as a demand like this was, in an actual individual case, urged upon Luther, he had no solid ground on which to oppose it. Luther could not, upon his principles, say at once that it was wrong for a Christian to marry a second wife; nor *did* he ever. He was asked the question more than once, and always pointedly refused to say that such an act was absolutely wrong. Thus he writes to an inquirer: 'To your first question, whether a man may have more than one woman to wife, my answer is this. Unbelievers may do what they please; but Christian freedom is to be regulated according to love, so that every thing should be determined with a view to our neighbour's good, where no necessity or sin against faith or conscience prevents us. Now however every one seeks that freedom, which will serve and profit himself, without regard to his neighbour's benefit or edification; although S. Paul says, "All things are lawful to me, but all things are not expedient: Only use not your liberty for an occasion to the flesh."—Again, though the ancients had many wives, Christians are not to act after such an example, because there is no necessity, nor edification, nor special word of God, commanding this; and such great scandal and trouble might come from it. Therefore do not esteem the Christian as more free, unless there be some command of God with regard to such freedom.' In this answer he discourages the liberty of taking more than one wife, as fraught with scandal, and not serving to edification: he advises persons to do with one wife, but he cannot absolutely command them. As the Elector said: '*Lutherus scribit, se bigamiam non suadere.*' He dissuades as a counsellor and friend, he cannot and wishes not to do more. On the demand of the Landgrave then reaching them, this was the line which Luther's and Melancthon's answer adopted. They dissuaded him from the contemplated step, and told him of the scandal which would arise from it if known; but admitted at the same time that if he insisted upon it, they could not forbid it. The letter, which bears the names

of Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, Melander, Corvinus, Adam, Leningus, Winteferte, from beginning to end alternates from one to the other of these two points, and finally grants the permission required.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'With regard to the question, of which Master Bucer spoke with us, firstly, this is our opinion. Your grace knows and understands this yourself, that it is a very different thing to make a general law, and in a particular case to use a dispensation, out of weighty reasons, and yet according to Divine permission; for against God no dispensation has force. Now we cannot advise that it be openly introduced, and thus made a law, that each be allowed to have more than one wife. But should any thing of this get into print, your grace may conceive that this would be understood and adopted as a general law, whence much scandal and trouble would ensue. Therefore this is by no means to be adopted; and we pray your grace to consider how grievous it would be, if it were charged upon any one that he had introduced this law in the German nation, whence endless trouble in all marriages might be feared. As to what may be said against this, that what is right before God should be altogether allowed, this is true in a measure. If God has commanded it, or it is a necessary thing, it is true; but if it is not commanded nor necessary, other circumstances should be taken into account. Thus with regard to this question: God instituted marriage so that it was to be the union of two persons alone, and not of more. . . . .

In certain cases, however, a dispensation may be used,—as if a person taken captive in a foreign land should marry there, and on gaining his freedom should bring his wife with him,—or if long-continued sickness should supply a cause, as has been held at times with regard to lepers,—if in such cases a man takes another wife with the counsel of his pastor, not to introduce a law, but as a matter of necessity, such a man we could not condemn. Since, then, it is one thing to introduce a law, and another to use a dispensation, we humbly entreat your grace to consider, first, that care should in every way be taken that this matter be not brought publicly before the world as a law which everybody may follow. Next, since it is to be no law, but merely a dispensation, let your grace also consider the scandal, namely, that the enemies of the gospel would cry out that we are like the Anabaptists, who take several wives at once, and that the Evangelicals seek the liberty of taking as many wives as they please, according to the practice in Turkey. Again, what princes do, gets abroad much further than what is done by private persons. Again, if private persons hear of such an example in their lords, they desire that the like should be allowed to them; as we see how easily a practice spreads. . . . .

Therefore let your grace, in consideration of all these causes, the offence, the other cares and labours, and the weakness of body, weigh this matter well. Be also pleased to consider that God has given your grace fair young princes and princesses with this consort, and be content with her, as many others must have patience under their marriage, to avoid offence. For that we should excite or urge your grace to an offensive innovation, is far from our mind. For your country and others might reproach us on account thereof, which would be intolerable to us, because we are commanded in God's word to regulate marriage and all human matters according to their first divine institution, and, so far as possible, to keep them therein, and to avert whatever may offend any one. Such, too, is now the way of the world, that people like to throw all the blame upon the preachers, if any thing unpleasant falls out; and men's hearts, among high and low, are unsteady; and all sorts of things are to be feared. But if your grace do not quit your unchaste life, for that you write that this is not possible, we would rather that your grace stood in better case before God, and lived with a good conscience, for your grace's happiness and the good of your country and people. If, however, your grace should at length resolve to take another wife, we think that this should be kept secret, as was said above of the dispensation; namely, that your grace, and the lady, with some confidential persons, should know your grace's mind and conscience through confession. From this no particular rumour or scandal would arise; for it is not unusual for princes to have concubines; and

Now this act of Luther's does not appear one which we need hesitate to judge. It is the act of deliberately permitting a Christian to have two wives, and thus deliberately violating the Christian code with respect to marriage. Marriage is by original institution monogamy: departure from that institution was allowed afterward, in condescension to man's weakness and hardness of heart; but Christianity reverted to it, and enforced it as an inviolable law;<sup>1</sup> and of this law Luther deliberately sanctioned the transgression. Nevertheless, as Archdeacon Hare has attempted an apology for this act of Luther's, it is due to him to see what he has to say. Archdeacon Hare then sums up his apology thus: 'Such is the amount of Luther's sin, or rather error,—for sin I dare not call it,—in this affair, in which the voice of the world, ever ready to believe evil of great and good men, has so severely condemned him, without investigation of the facts, although the motives imputed to him are wholly repugnant to those which governed his conduct through life. He did not compromise any professed principles, as the reviewer accuses him of doing: he did not inculcate polygamy, as the pamphleteer charges him with doing. But inasmuch as he could not discover any direct, absolute prohibition of polygamy in the New Testament, while it was practised by the Patriarchs, and recognised in the law, he did not deem himself warranted in condemning it absolutely, when there appeared in special cases to be a strong necessity, either with a view to some great national object, or for the relief of a troubled conscience. Here it behoves us to bear in mind, on the one hand, what importance Luther attached, as all his writings witness, to this high ministerial office of relieving troubled consciences: and it may mitigate our condemnation of his error,—which after all was an error on the right side, its purpose being to substitute a hallowed union for unhallowed license.'—Pp. 857, 858.

Now this defence holds good against one particular *inference*

---

although all the people would not know what the circumstances were, the intelligent would be able to guess them, and would be better pleased with such a quiet way of life, than with adultery and other wild and licentious courses. Nor are we to heed everything that people say, provided our consciences stand right. Thus far, and this we deem right. For that which is permitted concerning marriage in the law of Moses, is not forbidden in the Gospel.'—*Hare's Mission of the Comforter*, pp. 831—834.

<sup>1</sup> However the question of casuistry, with respect to the two wives of a heathen, brought with him at his conversion into the Christian Church may be disposed of, the decision will not at all affect the inviolability of the law of monogamy with respect to Christians. The act of bigamy, there, is a heathen act, and, therefore, however *ex post facto* dealt with, no precedent whatever for the act in a Christian.

which has been drawn from Luther's act. Sir William Hamilton appears to us hard upon Luther in charging him with a wish to promulgate polygamy, and in regarding this act as only the sanction, in a particular instance, of a practice which he desired at heart to establish generally. The whole language of the answer to the Landgrave shows that the liberty allowed him, was only allowed as a dispensation, and that the permitting authority was reluctant even to grant that: it indicated men feeling themselves under a difficulty: afraid of their own reputation if they gave leave, afraid of the Landgrave if they refused it; unable to reject polygamy as wrong in principle, and yet shrinking from it when threatened with the fact. But whatever becomes of Sir W. Hamilton's view, the *act* still remains to be excused—the act of allowing a particular person to have two wives; and what does the apologist say here? The substance of his apology is little more than a statement of the offence: Luther, he says, could not prohibit polygamy in an individual instance, *because* he did not think the Gospel absolutely prohibited polygamy. But the fact that Luther did not think so, is Luther's offence. Nobody could blame him for acting upon a view, if he had a true view: the charge is against his view to begin with: the view he held that polygamy was consistent with Christianity. The subordinate defences, suggested to take off from the edge of the offence, and 'mitigate our condemnation,' are hardly more fortunate. 'Luther,' the apologist tells us, 'attached great importance to the high ministerial office of relieving troubled consciences,' and in this particular case acted on that motive. Now it is difficult to see how the conscience of the Landgrave of Hesse can, except by a very lax use of the term, be put under the class of what are called 'troubled consciences.' The Landgrave said, 'If you do not allow me to have another wife, I shall only take the same liberty under another shape; and therefore you may as well allow me.' The matter of trouble to the Landgrave's conscience was not a past sin of which he wanted to repent, but a future sin which he intended to commit, if he had not a particular license given him. If to give such license for such a cause be called 'giving relief to a troubled conscience,' we see no reason why a license to break the whole of the ten commandments may not be given to persons upon their certifying beforehand that they intend to break them, whether they have the license or no; and why such general license should be refused the title of a general relief to troubled consciences. The validity of such an excuse entirely depends on the previous question, whether an act of polygamy is absolutely wrong or no in a Christian? If not in itself wrong, however inexpedient the



general adoption might be, it is subject-matter of dispensation, and a considerate spiritual guide may allow it in a particular case, in order to preserve a person from committing what is wrong. But if an act of polygamy is absolutely wrong in a Christian, to allow it in order to save him from doing what is wrong, is as bad reasoning as it is loose morality. A man who cannot submit to the law of monogamy, may or may not be a tolerable heathen, but he is not a Christian, and has no right to belong to the Church of Christ upon earth. And to accommodate Christian law to him, in order that it may be said that he does not break Christian law, is to injure Christianity, and to do him no good. Indeed, the reason why the permission was given, which in Archdeacon Hare's opinion so mitigates the offence of giving it, appears to us strongly to aggravate it. For what was the ground of the permission? Was it one of those eccentric and unlooked-for reasons which occur once or twice in the world in the course of a century? No: the Landgrave urged no reason but what a thousand men in every city of Christendom might urge the next day. His one and sole reason was that his present wife was a disagreeable person, and that he wanted another: he gave no grounds but that of simple desire on his part, that the indulgence should be allowed. Differing from Sir William Hamilton, in the view that Luther *wished* to promote general polygamy, we must yet say that the fact of the permission of a particular case of it, on such a ground as this, was a precedent for the widest spread of it; for what was there to stop the operation of a precedent which admitted simple strong desire as a sufficient reason? Whatever Luther wished, his *act* was a generally unsettling one, and capable of bearing the largest and most systematic results in the way of innovation.

Nor can we admit, again, a comparison, which the apologist institutes between the conduct of a divine who sanctions an act of polygamy, and that of one who connives at licentiousness; a comparison which he decides in favour of the former. However much to blame Luther was,—says Archdeacon Hare,—he was not so much to blame as Bossuet; for Bossuet connived at much greater immorality in Louis XIV. than Luther sanctioned in Philip of Hesse. But there is a fallacy in this reasoning; for, were it granted that Louis XIV.'s immorality was worse than that of Philip of Hesse's, and that Bossuet connived at it, the act of sanctioning is a different genus of offence altogether from the act of connivance; and to sanction a less crime is much worse than to connive at a greater. If a person commits a wrong act, and another does not rebuke him for it, the latter is guilty of not asserting the truth; but if he *sanctions* the same,

or a much smaller offence in him, he asserts an untruth, and calls that right which is not right. If Bossuet connived, he acted wrong, but he only committed himself; Luther, in sanctioning, committed Christianity. Still less do we see any mitigation of Luther's act, in the confidence, spirit, and self-possession with which he took the disclosure of it, when that was made:—

‘However severely,’ says Archdeacon Hare, ‘we may blame Luther for these errors of judgment, for his allowing himself to be influenced in such a matter by *misericordia* and *humanissima facilitas*, still, when the secret is disclosed, when the scandal gets wind, how does the heroic grandeur of his character, the might of his invincible faith, rise out of the trial! The rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon his house: but it stood fast, because it was founded upon a Rock.’

‘In a beautiful letter, written in the following month of June, 1540, to Melancthon, who was grievously oppressed by the scandal occasioned when the Landgrave, in opposition to their counsel, let his second marriage be known, Luther thus reminds him of the principles which had guided them in their opinion. [We omit the quotation.] In this time of trouble Luther's heroic faith shines forth still more brightly from its contrast with Melancthon's weakness. The latter was quite crushed, and brought to the very verge of death. Luther, on the other hand, feels strong as ever from his unshaken trust in his Heavenly Supporter. “Quare frustra nos occidimus” (he says in the letter, just quoted, to Melancthon), “aut tristitia impedimus cognitionem victoris illius omnium mortuum et tristitiarum? Qui enim vicit Diabolum, et judicavit principem hujus mundi, nonne et cum eo judicavit et vicit hoc scandalum? Nam si etiam hoc præsens scandalum desinat, dabit deinde alias, et forte majores turbas scandalorum, quas, si vivimus, in eodem tamen victore vincemus, et ridebimus quoque. Nihil est malorum vel inferni de quo ille non dixerit et voluerit sese intelligi, *Ego vici mundum, confidite*.—Valeat Satan; propter ipsum nec mœreamus, nec tristemur: in Christo autem Domino lætemur et exultemus: ipse deducet in nihilum omnes inimicos nostros. Nondum sumus in Davidis exemplo, cujus causa longe desperatio fuit, nec tamen cecidit: nec ista causa cadet. Cur ergo te maceras, cum finalis causa stet certe, id est, victoria Christi, etsi formalis et media nonnihil deformetur isto scandalo?—Nos, qui te sincere amamus, diligenter et efficaciter orabimus. Vale in Christo, et noli timere nec sollicitari. Omnem solitudinem in eum projicias, qui vult esse pro nobis sollicitus, idque credi jussit et exigit.—Stabit illud: *Ego vici mundum: et vos vivetis quia Ego vivo*. Iterum vale, et sis lætus et quietus, oro, sicut petimus, imo sicut præcipit Dominus.” This is the man whom the reviewer audaciously charges with a “skulking compromise of all professed principle,” and with violating the Gospel, “trembling only at discovery.”

‘The reluctance to have the matter known, it is plain, was unmixed with any personal consideration in Luther; though it was otherwise with Melancthon, whose utter abashment on this occasion shows how thoroughly Luther understood his character, when he said to him years before, *Pecca fortiter*. It was just after this last letter of Luther's, that Melancthon, as he tells Camerarius in the words just cited, was at the very point of death, and was restored to life in an almost miraculous manner, as it seemed, by the intensely fervent prayers, and the energetic friendly comfort and friendly rebukes of Luther. When Luther, who had been sent for on account of

Melancthon's dangerous illness, arrived, he found, the historian tells us, "that his eyes were sunk, his senses gone, his speech stopped, his hearing closed, his face fallen in and hollow, and, as Luther said, *facies erat Hippocratica*. He knew nobody, ate and drank nothing. When Luther saw him thus disfigured, he was frightened above measure, and said to his companions, 'God forfend! how has the devil defaced this Organon!' He then turned forthwith to the window, and prayed fervently to God. 'Then,' said Luther, 'Our Lord God could not but hear me; for I threw my sack before his door, and wearied his ears with all his promises of hearing prayers, which I could repeat out of Holy Writ; so that He could not but hear me if I were ever to trust in his promises.' Hereupon he grasped Philip by the hand: '*Bono animo esto, Philippe; non morieris*. Although God has reason to slay, yet He willeth not the death of a sinner, but that he should be converted and live. He has pleasure in life, not in death. If God called and received the very greatest sinners that ever were upon earth, Adam and Eve, again into favour, much less will He reject thee, my Philip, or let thee perish in sin and despair. Therefore give no place to the spirit of sorrow, and be not thine own murderer; but trust in the Lord, who can slay and make alive again.' For Luther well knew the burthen of his heart and conscience. Being thus taken hold of and addressed, Philip began to draw breath again, but could not say anything for a good while. Then he turned his face straight upon Luther, and began to beg him for God's sake not to detain him any longer; that he was now on a good journey; that he should let him go; that nothing better could befall him. 'By no means, Philip,' said Luther; 'thou must serve our Lord God yet longer.' Thus Philip by degrees became more cheerful, and let Luther order him something to eat; and Luther brought it himself to him, but Philip refused it. Then Luther forced him with these threats, saying: 'Hark, Philip, thou must eat, or I excommunicate thee.' With these words he was overpowered, so that he ate a very little; and thus by degrees he gained strength again." See the account cited by Bretschneider in his Edition of Melancthon, iv. p. xvii. I enter into these details of Luther's conduct connected with this affair, because it has often been represented as utterly disgraceful and destructive of his moral character; whereas on this, as on every other occasion, the best vindication of him is the truth. The more one knows of him, the grander he becomes, the more, too, he wins not merely reverence, but love.

The power of mind which this passage discloses in Luther is, we admit, very great, and it stands out, unquestionably, in strong relief, by the side of the feebleness of Melancthon. But it is a question whether, under such circumstances, Melancthon's feebleness is not a more creditable state of mind than Luther's power. The power which Luther shows is the power of putting a good face upon a bad business, and braving out an awkward step once taken. He says to himself, It cannot be helped now, we must make the best of it; and he does make the best of it, and carries off the act with a swing. Such a power shows a strong, forcible character; but, before it is put forward as a defence of that act which elicited it, it ought to be carefully distinguished from that quality which, in common parlance, bears an unfavourable name. Luther was a great man; but the assurance of a great man must no more be

admitted to atone for a wrong act, than that of a little man.

In judging of this act of Luther's, it is indeed difficult to distinguish how much of it belonged to speculative audacity, and how much to moral laxity. The subject of marriage, so far as it suggested questions for the intellect to decide upon, was an intellectual subject; and Luther approached it in that independent and audacious spirit in which he approached other matters of doctrine. He had a pleasure in invading an occupied ground; in theorizing where all had been considered settled; in clearing away old ideas, and laying down new ones. So far his impulse was a speculative one, and part of the charge of moral laxity is drained off into that of intellectual presumption. But with the speculative impulse there mingles, too evidently, moral laxity also. The general tone of Luther with respect to the particular department of morality here alluded to, where not positively offensive, is free and easy, and unbecoming the severity of a Christian. The excuses of a temper rudely frank, of a ready tongue always saying what came uppermost, and of an argumentative furor always pushing him to coarseness as a form of strength, might be excuses for defective strictness and delicacy on such a subject, were the defects those of language only: but the defects in Luther's case are more than these. It is not that he uses that coarseness of language which might be attributed to the age rather than to the individual; but he discloses mental levity and mental laxity on this subject. He plainly wants those severe ideas in relation to it which as a Christian he ought to have. With such an unfavourable context in Luther's general language to fall back upon, on the subject of the act now before us, we cannot but express our deep and sincere regret, that Archdeacon Hare should have undertaken the defence of such an act. He has conceived an unbounded admiration for Luther, and, having conceived it, his generosity impels him to defend Luther at all hazards. But in such a case, the maxim of being just before you are generous is well worthy of attention; and an apologist, however enthusiastic, should never defend his author beyond the point where the defence does justice to himself.

Some social and some doctrinal consequences of Luther's movement have now been exhibited; and we see the great author of the Reformation struggling, at every step, with disagreeable and ominous developments of his own act: coercing, recalling, denouncing, protesting; assailed and assailing; lamenting and persecuting; harassed with awkward questions; obliged to go farther than he wanted to go; and put in the position of a spectator of his own movement, anxiously and nervously

watching results which were now, in a great degree, out of his hands. As events drove him more and more into this position, and he had more and more the pain of seeing consequences which he did not like, and yet could not help, taking place: as he had more and more to bear disgusts and feel weakness, he fell back considerably upon that melancholy in which he had commenced his career. Never for an instant flinching from the antagonistic or dogmatic side of his position; hurling mortal defiance on Rome to the last, and full of his own great fundamental doctrine,—he yet could not shake off the inward sadness and vexation, which the ever rising facts of a general religious unsettlement, appealing to his eyes and ears, caused. And the melancholy of his character, so powerful as a stimulus at the commencement of his career, was prolific of disgusts toward the close.

Luther's melancholy is a feature in him, which there happens to be an especial call to notice, on account of some extraordinary and eccentric shapes which it at times assumed, and its connexion with those grotesque scenes of supernaturalism which figure so prominently in some parts of his life. Luther had then what is called a natural and constitutional melancholy. There is a kind of melancholy, which we call natural and constitutional, which acts upon no discernible cause but simply because it exists, and is an original disposition of the mind, in connexion with the bodily constitution. Again, there is a rational melancholy, which refers itself consciously to causes—more especially that great fundamental one, the existence of evil in the world: which is ever before it in the shape of one or other of its particular results, one or other painful, disgusting, or humiliating, event. Both of these kinds of melancholy enter into the composition of what is called a melancholy temperament; and both of them are in principle suitable and becoming to such a creature as man, in such a world as the present one. Those partial obscurations of nature, and ebbings of the animal spirits, which constitute natural melancholy, so far from being in themselves mere awkwardnesses and inappropriate interruptions, fall in harmoniously with a perishable state: they are natural anticipations of the final withdrawal of that gift of life which awaits all creatures here;—fit tremblings of that which is one day to fall, and vanishings of that which is one day to expire. Thus the Psalmist pictures even the inferior creatures as sometimes feeling a cloud over their spirits, and suffering obscurations of their animal life—foreshadowing its final departure: '*When Thou hidest Thy face they are troubled: when Thou takest away their breath they die, and are turned again to their dust:*' and the picture elevates and dignifies rather than lowers the inferior creatures in our

eyes. That melancholy, also, which is the offspring of thought and perception, is becoming in its place; and the total want of it argues an insensibility to certain obvious facts connected with this visible system. Luther's melancholy, then, is not in itself an unpleasing feature; it rather appeals to our sympathies. We see him, in spite of his uproarious hilarity, and overflowing and successful energy of mind, not a happy man. *Post equitem sedet atra cura*: he drives the chariot of the Reformation with fury, but he has a lingering gloom at heart. Even his fury is partly a remedial one, indulged as a balance and quietus to a strong natural counter sadness. And his immoderate mirth and flow of spirits sit often but superficially upon him, covering and relieving an inwardly vexed and troubled mind, rather than representing a light one.

But it is evident that melancholy, like other mental passions and affections, should be under the control of reason. The passion of anger is in itself a noble and lofty one, and yet is liable to run into coarseness and madness, unless it is checked by a higher principle. The melancholic tendencies of the human character, however deep and true a part of it, must in the same way be kept in check by a higher principle. Christian reason, *i. e.* faith, informs us that this whole system\* of things, notwithstanding the disturbing appearances in it, will finally issue in absolute good. Christian reason, therefore, forbids vague, irregular, and licentious melancholy. From the ultimate height of a certain issue it controls the commotions and depressions, the darkness and troubles, of passionate and sensitive nature. It brings the melancholy of the human character into form and shape; chastens, subdues, and refines it. Go over in succession the portraits of those great religious men upon whom the world has tried all its discouragements and disappointments, and see if in any one of them there appears a symptom of loose submission to the involuntary depressions of nature. Melancholy, indeed, appears, but it is a melancholy of perfect form and mould; tranquil, grave, and self-possessed, as if a sculptor had modelled it. You see this distinctive fact, that in their case the mind was above its own melancholy, looked down calmly upon it as an inferior part of itself; kept it under, and reduced it to order and law. You see that, conversing and living in heart with the One Eternal Substance of Good, they were not liable to be unsettled and confounded at the appearances of evil.

But Luther could not check or control his melancholic temperament; and it consequently rose into morbid excesses, got the upper hand, and became oppressive and overwhelming. He describes himself as suffering often horrible fits of despair.



Nay, he even incorporated these loose and degrading prostrations into his system, and tested the religious advancement of the believer by them. Does he feel occasionally desperate, all ground of faith gone, and the world, the flesh, and the devil triumphant?—if so, he is a child of God; if not, he is without his proper Christian evidences and tokens. Such melancholy as this was a loose, disordered one—a mere cowering before the principle of evil; for nobody can despair, even of his own personal salvation, without a slavish succumbing for the time to evil, as if it had, in his own case at any rate, a necessary domination. Luther indeed could not control his melancholy, because he did not discipline himself. The first thing which a man of a melancholic temperament ought to do, if he wants to keep that temperament in order, is to practise some self-discipline. Many great men have had exactly the same constitution as Luther, and have controlled it by this means. But Luther did not discipline himself; his life was egregiously defective on that head. He vented his humours unscrupulously, used his tongue immoderately; ate and drank freely, and did generally what he liked. With many generous and noble gifts, he was not a self-disciplinarian; and he suffered for it. If the antagonist to melancholy is hope, we have the word of an apostle for the truth, that this hope can only come by experience, and that this experience can only come by practice. It is impossible that a man can have real substantial hope, *i. e.* belief in the ultimate triumph of good over evil, who does not feel and experience that triumph to some extent in himself. How can we reason but from what we know? One who is conquering evil in himself has actually working within him a portion of that very victorious spirit itself which is to conquer universal evil; and, believing in the expansion of what he actually feels, he has hope. But if a man lets himself run wild, or lie fallow, this sensible ground of hope is gone; and he will be liable to fall into melancholy. Hope and practice act and re-act upon each other: hope is a stimulus to practice; practice is the foundation of hope. On the other hand, a lax habit of mind protrudes an indefinite gloom before it, and license is compensated for by melancholy.

But Luther's habit became worse than morbid. The reader may qualify it as he likes, but there is a truth contained in a summary dictum with respect to a particular class of minds;—that they cannot be melancholy without being mad. Cromwell's melancholy ran into eccentricities and monkey tricks: 'starting 'from his bed in the dead of the night, and troubled strangely 'with "phansies about the cross" of Huntingdon, he would, 'after an interval, suddenly plunge into fantastic shapes of

‘merriment.’ It seems invidious to allude to the amiable Cowper: at the same time he is an instance of a person in whom a melancholy madness seems to have had its full swing, and to have encountered no counteracting power in his mind. The religion of the Church does appear to have a power of shaping and ordering the melancholy of the human mind, while inferior religions too often let it grow into more or less of insanity. Luther alludes in his Table-talk to temptations he had felt to commit suicide: ‘Sometimes when I have had a knife in my hand, terrible thoughts have come upon me.’ His melancholy revelled in a coarse supernaturalism, and summoned grotesque phantoms from the lower world. He spoke of one being as constantly near him, not in the sense in which he is near all men, as mankind’s great tempter, but in some extraordinary and local way. It is needless to introduce here the well-known stories which describe Luther’s intimate and continual intercourse with the devil: many of them are not fit for these pages, and anybody who has the curiosity may read them collected, with the greatest attention to his convenience, in the sixth chapter of the book of M. Michelet’s ‘Life.’ It is enough to say, that Luther speaks of a repeated local and sensible presence of the devil, manifesting himself by sight, words, and even by touch. We speak of his language. How far such language may be metaphorical sometimes, notwithstanding its simple and matter-of-fact surface, we will not undertake to determine. Luther sometimes alludes to the ordinary operations of nature as those of the devil, and expresses in words a personal presence of that being where, from the nature of the case, he could hardly really mean it. ‘One day when there was a great storm abroad, Luther said: “’Tis the devil who does this; the winds are nothing else but good and bad spirits. Hark! how the devil is puffing and blowing.”’ So in another instance, an ordinary accident is attributed to the personal agency of the devil, simply because it is an awkward one, and because he seems to consider that all awkward events proceed from the devil, as the evil principle. As he was uniting Duke Philip of Pomerania and the Elector’s sister, in the middle of the marriage ceremony the nuptial ring escaped from his hold. He was seized with temporary alarm, but soon recovering himself exclaimed: ‘Hark ye, devil, this is no affair of mine! ’tis all lost time for thee.’ Everything or person, in short, which offended Luther was the devil in Luther’s eyes:—To Carlstadt, ‘I know thee, devil of mine.’ To the Anabaptists—‘Well, good devil, what next?’ The use of the name was a vent for his irritability, and answered for him a purpose very analogous to that which it answers among the vulgar. It was a form of swearing;

though differing widely from ordinary swearing, in being significant, and connected with a general view. He had a strong sense of abstract evil; he retaliated on all offensive matter by referring it immediately to this evil: and a religious philosophy mixed with the temper of common vituperation. Such passages as these suggest a doubt how far Luther's relation of any sensible acts and presence of Satan is real or metaphorical. His language admits sometimes of a simply vituperative, sometimes of a simply imaginative meaning, while the surface is a matter-of-fact one; and Luther betrays a prophetic sympathy with that peculiarly German line of thought which, spreading personality on the largest scale throughout nature, and making individuals of winds, trees, and brooks, leaves the reader in doubt all the time, whether the personality which the story intends is a real or practical one. On the other hand, he evidently held with great pertinacity to the old popular legends of sensible Satanic agency; and his allusions have generally a matter-of-fact tone which it is difficult to explain away. He describes himself, then, as in this close and intimate intercourse with the devil; the devil presses him with arguments, 'draws him out of rooms, forces him out of bed, and throws him into perspirations. 'I know the devil thoroughly well: he has often had very hard hold of me, but he has been obliged to let me go at last: he has over and over again pressed me so close that I hardly knew whether I was alive or dead.' These attacks aimed at his faith; they 'threw him sometimes into such despair that he did not know whether there was a God, and had great doubts of the Lord Jesus Christ;' and he referred to them afterwards as 'agonies,' with the same pride with which a soldier refers to his battles. The celebrated midnight disputation with the devil at the castle of Wartburg, which need not be more than alluded to here, was one of these. In that interview the accuser threw in his teeth all his compliances with the established superstitions during his days of ignorance, and especially his celebration of the mass; and a long argument against the mass is put into the devil's mouth. We will take this opportunity of correcting a mistake of M. Audin and some others with respect to this argument. M. Audin regards it as a genuine theological argument on the part of the devil, carried on with the object of disproving the doctrine of the mass; and makes it a confession on Luther's part, that he and the devil agreed together in opinion. It is impossible, of course, that Luther could mean this; because, by such a confession he would be *ipso facto* confessing himself in the wrong with respect to his theology; and this, it is unnecessary to say, he never did. The devil in this interview does not argue as a theologian, but as an accuser; nor is the conclusion

of the erroneousness of the mass his object, but the proof, through that conclusion, of Luther's sin in having celebrated it. An offence must be proved to be such before the offender is convicted in consequence: and the devil argues for the sinfulness of the mass, as he would for that of any moral offence, not in order to express a theological view in the one case, or a moral view in the other, but in order to compass a conviction of the man. The function of accuser is always the principal one assigned to Satan by Luther: the devil 'is always placing before 'his eyes the law, sin and death, and makes use of this triad to 'torment him,' *'Est mirabilis artifex aggravandi peccatum;'* 'he 'goes on with the old story, accusing him of sin:' and in this capacity of accuser he visited Luther at Wartburg.

Upon those personal conflicts with Satan, and the character of Christian trials which Luther attributes to them, one remark is to be made. That is unquestionably an absurd and dangerous view, which in any degree tends to divert attention from the substantial trials of substantial life, to an eccentric and indescribable class of trials. The great trials of life are of one substantial class: 'Every man is tempted,' says S. James, 'when he is drawn away of his own lust and 'enticed.' The medium of ordinary nature is the medium through which our trial comes; and the temptations of life lie in the every-day lusts, appetites, and passions, which we carry about with us in our own bodies and minds. If any view of Christian warfare draws us away from these, as the great, difficult, and arduous trials of life, there is no necessity to ask another question: the view must be absurd. But Luther's view goes far to produce this result. He has a certain class of irregular and unintelligible—not to say, ridiculous—trials, which he sets up as the great ones of Christian life; far above the ordinary ones, of which he speaks quite slightly in comparison: 'The temptation of the flesh is a small matter; 'but God defend us from the great temptations which touch 'upon eternity; when we are beaten about among them, we 'know not whether God is the devil, or the devil God:' that is to say, he asserts, that these irregular and eccentric 'agonies' we are speaking of; these sensible personal assaults of Satan, producing fright and perspiration, are much more serious and important trials than the temptations of the flesh. A more absurd and debasing view of human trial could not well be conceived. The devil is indeed, as we know from Scripture, our great enemy. But that mighty and dreadful being, to whom of all the fallen creatures of God, the wisdom of the serpent first belonged, knows better than to assail the human race by the mere frightening and overwhelming power of a local

and direct presence. He assails us through that machinery of the flesh, and the world by which we are surrounded; and through that medium gets access to the real substantial man. To appear and to frighten, is child's play; power which acts formidably, acts through a medium. The world's great tempter made a common local assailant of, loses his dreadful character, and becomes, as the legendary stories, and as the style of Luther's own remarks upon him, abundantly indicate, a laughing-stock. The weight of invisibility taken off, the human mind is at ease, and can amuse itself, and joke at his expense. This constant intercourse with a sensible Satan, and the elevation of this form of temptation above the substantial and natural ones, have their fruits in Luther's life. While he was attending to the trials which made him perspire, he neglected those which made him rage and vilify; and the temptations of the flesh, of which he thought so slightly, in some degree vindicated their position.

Of the melancholic habit of Luther's mind, thus rough, grotesque, unshaped, undisciplined, there was another and an important development. To one system or theory undisciplined melancholy generally goes to satisfy and quiet itself: and that is fatalism. The theory of fatalism has this peculiar attraction, that by one single simple idea, which occupies no more space than a needle's point in the mind, it accounts for all things that ever were or can be, the whole medley of this visible system—the one idea, viz. of '*must*.' As an artificial goal to the intellect, the fatalist theory is eminently great and satisfying. Luther was a fatalist: that is to say, he was an extreme predestinarian: not a believer in simple blind fate, he persisted in carrying out the one truth of God's foreknowledge into all its logical consequences, without qualification from other truths. He took his stand on the idea of Deity, and argued thus. The idea of Deity implies absolute and omnipotent predestination; free will is contrary to predestination: therefore free will is contrary to the idea of Deity. He first defined free will as licentious, and insulting to the Divine prerogative, and then condemned it as such. To allow man free will and mastery over his own actions, was to give the Deity nothing to do but to stand by an idle spectator of the world's course, waiting for a chance issue; to convert him into an '*idolum Fortunæ*,' a god like Homer's, who was absent from his government because he had gone to dine with the Ethiopians. This was impossible; therefore man could not have free will and mastery over his own actions.<sup>1</sup> He then carried

<sup>1</sup> '*Liberum arbitrium nemini nisi soli Deo convenit. Arbitrium fortassis homini aliquod recte attribuis, sed liberum arbitrium tribuere in rebus divinis nimium*

his theory through the opposition of facts, and the repugnancy of nature. Allowing the phenomenon of free will, he explained it as being a phenomenon only, and not a reality. We are not dragged by the neck, he says, to do things which we hate: we do voluntarily that which we will to do, but that very will is a necessary will, and not a free one.<sup>1</sup>

There is not seldom in Luther's air, action, language, that which, when once our attention has caught it, carries us back to these ideas of fatalism. A careless ease, an *abandon*, a species of indifference, as if not he but some external power were acting, appears. Retrospects of life have generally, indeed, something of a dreamy tone about them; and yet that tone in Luther's attracts our attention. 'My father went to Mansfeldt, and became a miner there. It was there I was born. That I was afterwards to become bachelor of arts, doctor of divinity, and what not, was assuredly not written in the stars, at least, not to ordinary readers. How I astonished everybody when I turned monk! and again, when I exchanged the brown cap for another. These things greatly vexed my father—nay, made him quite ill for a time. After that, I got pulling the pope about by the hair of his head; I married a runaway nun; I had children by her. Who saw these things in the stars? Who would have told any one beforehand they were to happen?' Again, it is often difficult to discriminate between what is positive energy and what is a negative abandonment of himself to a swing. Much of the actual strength of his style, for instance, seems to come from carelessness to what he says,

est. Quod liberi arbitrii vox omnium aurium judicio proprie id dicitur, quod potest et facit erga Deum quæcunque libuerit, nulla lege, nullo imperio cohibitum. Neque enim servum dixeris liberum qui sub imperio domini agit: quanto minus hominem vel Angelum recte liberum dicimus, qui sub imperio plenissimo Dei (ut peccatum et mortem taceam) sic degunt, ut nec momento consistere suis viribus possint.—*Oper.* vol. ii. p. 442.

Again—

'Nec patimur neque recipimus mediocritatem illam, quam nobis consulit bono, ut credo, animo; scilicet ut libero arbitrio perpusillum concedamus, quo facilius pugnancia Scripturæ et incommoda prædicta tollantur. Nam ista mediocritate nihil est causæ consultum neque quidquam profectum . . . Ideo ad extrema eundem est, ut totum negetur liberum arbitrium, et omnia ad Deum referantur.'—*Oper.* vol. i. p. 475.

<sup>1</sup> 'Necessario dico, non coacte sed necessitate immutabilitatis. Non violenter, velut raptus obtorto collo, nolens facit malum, sed sponte et libente voluntate facit. Verum hanc libentiam non potest suis viribus omittre, coercere, aut mutare, sed pergit volendo et libendo.'—*De Serv. Arbit. Oper.* vol. ii. p. 434.

'Quid ad me si liberum arbitrium non cogatur sed volenter faciat quod facit! Sufficit mihi quod concedis necessario fore, ut volenter faciat, nec aliter habere se queat, si Deus ita præscierit.'—*Oper.* vol. ii. p. 463. The concession alluded to is the 'necessitas consequentiæ,' or the predestination on God's part, which Erasmus of course allowed, but balanced by denying the 'necessitas consequentiæ,' i. e. denying subsequent slavery of will on man's part. Luther takes his concession without the counterbalance to it.



and his vigour to have much to do with the absence of an internal check. The prodigious ease and freedom with which he made his observations upon men and things is that almost of an irresponsible person. His summary treatment of Scripture, bestowed with such an air of negligence, suggests the same remark. When he criticizes the Epistle of S. James, in the passage quoted above, and decides that it contains many excellent remarks, and that its author was doubtless a worthy man, though antiquated in his opinions; that he, Luther, did not consider him inspired, but had no objection to any one else considering him so who chose, we can almost suppose him dreaming, so little does he seem to realize the shock he is giving to Christian faith. Luther's career, with all its activities, betrays some features of the dream: and he seems to move with a self-moving order of events. Thus he marries his Catharine Bora rather as if he were dreaming. He seems hardly to know why he marries; no strong attachment to her, no call to marriage, generally, induces him. The step lowered him in his own estimation. No theory could make the marriage of a monk and a nun not ignominious; no theory could make it necessary for Luther to marry at all. To the apostle of a great religious movement, who had lived forty years of his life without marrying, the pleasures of a domestic life could not be necessary: and he had plenty to do without encumbering himself with its cares. Fate, however, brought them together: she came in his way, and he married her, feeling all the time the deep blow to his self-respect. He would fain have converted the humiliation into a matter of spiritual congratulation, and believed that 'devils wept and angels 'smiled' over it; but an injured self-respect disturbed him, and did not leave him easy even in the midst of the charms and affections of wife and home.

'Medio de fonte leporum  
Surgit amari aliquid quod in ipsis floribus angit.'

The stars were unusually brilliant one evening, when he and Catharine were walking in the garden. 'What a brilliant 'light!' said Luther, as he looked upward; 'but it burns not 'for us.' 'And why are we to be excluded from the kingdom 'of heaven?' asked Catharine. 'Perhaps,' said Luther, with a sigh, 'because we left our convents.' Catharine—'Shall we 'return then?' Luther—'It is too late to do that.'

To the consolatory side, then, of this melancholy and fatalist temper, Luther betook himself, as the Reformation, getting in its spread more and more out of his hands, cast up its various, ugly, and shapeless developments. He went on repeating to himself—'It must be; this is the way of the world; this is

'what was to be expected.' He reposed disdainfully in the general maxim of the unvarying ingratitude of human nature to all its benefactors, temporal and spiritual. Here had he been working all his life for the very persons who were now throwing him off, and setting up their own mongrel and vile fancies. He had suffered as well as worked; he had gone through all the dark, subterranean, preparatory gloom, by which a great movement is ushered in, and borne the weight of innumerable internal struggles, temptations, and depressions; and now men who had done nothing but enjoy the fruits, claimed the credit and usurped the authority. *Audaculi!* Fine boasters and braggers now that the result was obtained; how would they have gone through the task of obtaining it? What mental agonies had they had—those tokens of the Spirit—those only sure evidences of God's proving and chastening love? They could enjoy day and sunshine well enough, but had they felt the horrors of the night? However, ingratitude was the property of human nature:—'The world did not deserve to have anything done for it by men of heart and conscience.' Even his domestic distresses assumed the shape of results of this universal law. One of his sons was a disobedient boy. 'He almost killed me once, and ever since I have lost all my strength of body. Thanks to him, I now thoroughly understand that passage where S. Paul speaks of children who kill their parents, not by the sword, but by disobedience. Such children seldom live long, and are never happy. . . . Oh, God! how wicked is this world! how monstrous the times in which we live! These are the times of which Christ said, *When the Son of Man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?* Happy they who died ere these days came upon the world?' The days were come, to which the prophecy—'My Spirit shall not always strive with men,' pointed; the last punishment which God through the mouth of the holy patriarchs threatened, was now in execution; and Germany was specially feeling it. 'See how Satan hasteneth and busieth himself; what troops of sects he hath raised against us! and what is to happen when I die? What hosts of Sacramentaries, Anabaptists, Antinomians, Servetians, Campanistæ, and heretics of all kinds will arise?' He questioned even whether the Bible itself would long keep its hold. 'There was commencing in the world a weariness of the word of God; a sign of ill promise. One of these days some new books would be started in competition, and the Bible be despised, slighted, pushed into a corner and thrown under the table.' He thought, as persons have often done when events have disturbed them, and hopes have been disappointed, that the end of the world was

approaching. 'In December last, the whole heavens were seen on fire above the church of Breslau; and another day, there were witnessed in the same place two circles of fire, one within the other, and in the centre of them a blazing pillar. These signs announce, it is my firm opinion, the approach of the last day. The empire is falling, kings are falling, princes are falling, the whole world totters, and, like a great house about to tumble down, manifests its coming destruction by wide gaps and crevices on its surface. This will infallibly happen, and ere long.'—'The hour of midnight approaches, when the cry will be heard, Behold, the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet Him.'

Under the vexation, annoyance, and sense of ill-usage which the medley of earthly events produces in those who have taken a prominent part in them, the mind often takes refuge in the idea of an end. It retaliates on its own discomforts by a keen realizing of the absolute ultimate cessation of that system of things which produces them; and brings in the future to annihilate the present. That which *will* once be quite certainly over, seems substantially over *now*, and to exist only by accident, and not in the nature of things. The consolatory powers of this idea are to a certain extent, indeed, sanctioned by Scripture; and the prophetic parts of the Old Testament, and almost all parts of the New, direct us in some way to them. The idea of an end again suggests the idea of that end shortly approaching: we realize the certainty of it by imagining its vicinity. Thus, from the beginning of Christianity downwards, the pious notion has ever more or less prevailed in the Church that the end of the world was shortly approaching: and even Apostles seem to have entertained it. Among the primitive Christians it was general; in every age of the Church any alarming posture of affairs, any general calamity, political, ecclesiastical, or physical, has been sufficient to elicit it, and we see the tendency even in our own times. Luther took refuge, then, in this idea: but he did so morbidly and angrily. He embraced it in the spirit of a person who felt an actual private interest, and private pique gratified by its accomplishment. A great movement of his own was producing many bad effects, and promising many worse: and he was disappointed, and he was apprehensive. There is something remarkable in the way in which Luther seems not to have been able to throw himself confidently upon the good part of human nature, for taking in and carrying out his system as he wished. Some founders of systems have been able to do this; they have said to themselves: This system will do its work well; many will abuse it, but, on the whole, the good part of human nature will be in alliance with it, and carry it out with

substantial success. Luther had no solid good part of human nature to depend on in this way; his theory made of man a broken reed only, and he could not trust him for doing anything like justice to his ideas. He had no pledge for events, and saw wildness and disorder before him. A general gloom as to the future thus hung over the latter part of his life. First, he distrusted it, and secondly, he cut it short. Insecure as to the ultimate issues of a great movement, the actual contents of the womb of time, the rising attitude of human thought; alarmed at symptoms, repelled by facts, he relieved his prospect by closing it up. He placed a dead wall before his eyes, and saw nothing beyond it. He fixed his imagination on an end, and wound up the hopeless disorders of a hopeless scene in an immediate day of judgment.

In this sketch of Luther's character and career we have omitted, or but incidentally alluded to, one striking side of him, and attended to the deeper rather than to the lighter features. We have seen him as a religious enthusiast, with the natural melancholy and the profound emotions which attach to such a character: and we have seen him as a practical man,—a shrewd, energetic, and statesmanlike leader and reformer. Another and a lighter part of him yet remains; but it falls so naturally under the concluding head of this article, to which we are now arrived, that we shall not interrupt the order of our remarks to introduce it previously.

One not unimportant inquiry then comes in, as a natural appendage or conclusion to this article; and that is, what consequences Luther has left behind him of his own peculiar religious mould, and how far he has managed to impress himself upon posterity: what ethical effects (for to go into all the effects would be too large an inquiry for our limits) survive of so wonderful a religious phenomenon.

First, then, we turn to the nation to which Luther belonged, and to which his labours were devoted, and ask how far Luther has impressed himself upon that nation, and left his own type visible in it. Turning to that nation we certainly see a peculiar type of character. The resident in Germany sends home his description of it: German literature and German poetry in a great degree bear their own witness to it. We see first, as a feature in the German character, a deep genial appreciation of the social and cheerful side of human life. The German is warm and hearty, full of lively feelings and affections, and most powerfully susceptible of that happiness which proceeds from their gratification. He enters into social and family life with a poetical enthusiasm, and endows the affections of nature with peculiar life and intensity. A peculiar appreciation

of nature herself is also apparent in him. The German descriptive poet forms with the beauty and splendour, the life and fertility, of nature an intimacy, and derives from them an enjoyment which no poet except himself, or one who has caught his spirit, does. He feels nature mingling with his soul, and conversing with him: he gives her an almost personal life. Trees, herbs, and flowers, the winds and waves, the storm and sunshine, the clouds and sky, black forest and fertile field, mountain and plain, valley and rock, and all the animal life which inhabits them, speak and hold communion with him as if they were intelligent things. But with this genial and overflowing appreciation of nature, animate and inanimate, the world physical and social, there mingles a subtle spirit which ensnares and corrupts. The forms of feeling are too luxuriant to be solid, and too expanded to be safe. The love of all natural things, matter or mind, needs reserve to keep it pure and healthy; and a cautious policy is as necessary in the world of feeling as it is in that of action. Wisdom speaks one language here—Hold back; distrust: ‘Know thyself,’ and be sure that all is sound, before the valve is opened. Caution is an actual part of true feeling, a substantial ingredient in its nature; as in chemistry one gas often enters into the composition of another. Those sacred poets of the old pagan world who sung the praises of *aiδῶς* taught this lesson: they taught that there was something in human nature higher than mere feeling, a holy monitor to whom all affection was meant to bow, and absolutely commit itself for training and fashioning. This lesson old pagan philosophy, though with the repulsive and daring exaggeration incident to human thinking, taught; when stoic and cynic warned men of their feelings, as if they were mere perturbations and diseases. The social feeling of the German overleaps this caution; and the popular fiction which describes German life betrays the fault. The social interior exhibited there is one in which the affections of nature luxuriate and exceed: there is a flood of mutual devotion; minds are wrapped up in each other, with an apparent forgetfulness that there are other people in the world beside themselves; an elysian self-importance pervades the scene, and we are merged in a central whirlpool of interest and emotion. Such a luxuriance is too great to stand; the scene approaches too nearly to the sensual; head and heart swim; and finally one infallible symptom of disease appears in the shape of one prevailing fault to which all point as the blot on German social life. Too wildly and fiercely intent on a legitimate happiness, feeling runs into illegitimate, and finds the law of fidelity too tight a chain. Undisciplined love wanders restlessly; and self-indulgent fancy unsettles the stable-

ness, and stains the sanctity of domestic life. The German appreciation of nature equally overleaps this caution; and if it has the merits of an overflowing enthusiasm, plunges deep into the dangers too. The poet adores a perishing external surface, as if it were the substance; he falls before the rock or mountain as if it were a god; he breathes into nature a kind of personal divinity; he loves and thanks devoutly his mother-earth for her luxuriance and beauty, her tenderness and care: he idolizes the creature, and holds communion with a pantheistic deity, and universal soul.

The whole German development of feeling, poetical and social, amidst all that is deep and sympathetic in it, thus shows one great defect. In the love of nature, and of man alike, one principle, for which the Greek language has a consecrated name, is sadly overborne. Another and a looser spirit appears, the same of which we see the still more obvious fruits in the direct department of theology; the same which has explained away inspiration, reduced the Bible to legend, dissolved the Christian creed, and left a void for the human to fill up at its will. Emptied of the preserving element of *αἰδώς*, no wonder that nature turns to rankness, and feeling to disease—that a hollow luxuriance betrays itself; that there is sin, and as surely as there is sin, failure and disappointment. Christianity has developed within the human heart a vast and boundless desire for happiness, a noble longing passion to which the pagan world was comparatively strange: but alas for those who forget the source from which they received the passion, and, throwing religious awe aside, try to satiate it with earth and nature! Nature tasked beyond her powers, gives way, and shows her hollowness when made divine. To them no sights or sounds of earth, however lovely; no beauty of land, or sky, or sea; no human sympathies and affections, will give even an ordinary traveller's repose. They have grasped at too much, and the treasure slips out of their hand. With all its elevation of nature's beatific powers, and tenderness to her children, few will say that the poetry of the German worshippers of nature, or of their school amongst ourselves, leaves, on the whole, a cheerful impression on the reader's mind. Amidst the glories of the landscape, and beneath the full meridian sun itself, faint sighs are heard, and wailing notes float past upon the breeze.

'When on the threshold of the green recess  
The wanderer's footsteps fell; he knew that death  
Was on him . . . . . he did place  
His pale lean hand upon the ragged trunk  
Of the old pine. Upon an ivied stone  
Reclined his languid head: his limbs did rest,  
Diffused and motionless, on the smooth brink



Of that obscurest chasm :—and thus he lay  
 Surrendering to their final impulses  
 The hovering powers of life. Hope and Despair,  
 The torturers, slept : no mortal pain or fear  
 Moved his repose. The influxes of sense ;  
 And his own being unalloyed by pain,  
 Yet feebler, and more feeble, calmly fed  
 The stream of thought, till he lay breathing there  
 At peace, and faintly smiling :—his last sight  
 Was the great moon, which o'er the western line  
 Of the wide world her mighty horn suspended,  
 With whose dun beams inwoven darkness seemed  
 To mingle.<sup>1</sup>

Such are the thoughts in which the disappointed passion for happiness takes refuge ; the consolations of a mind which has drunk too deep, and come to the dregs—which has found the hollowness of mere nature by trying her too much, and discovered decay and death amid her luxuriance and beauty.

The fund of amiableness and heartiness in Luther's character is as striking a fact about it as any other, public or private : and that is saying a great deal. It does show indeed a marvellous richness of the social affections and sympathies. It is a luxuriant and a glowing character ; nor did fatalism interfere with it, but rather helped to expand it. There are two kinds of fatalism, dogmatical and poetical. The dogmatical is rigid : the poetical is careless. Calvin's fatalism was dogmatical, and gave the formal mould, and gloomy gait, and sour physiognomy ; and produced puritanism. Luther's fatalism was careless, and set him at his ease. It was a fatalism which soothed the feelings rather than deadened them, and softened the mind instead of souring it. It said, *Carpe diem* : evil will have its way, and you cannot prevent it, do what you will : do not afflict yourself then. There is a cycle of events, and you cannot disturb it. Acquiesce in it like a wise man. '*Sua hora cuique.*' '*Omnia habent suum tempus.*' If evil comes, then bear it : if good, enjoy it. 'Joy hath its hour, as all things else : let us enjoy the present, and not be tormented about the future. Even vices cannot be mended till the appointed hour of amendment comes.' The 'appointed hour' was a great word with Luther ; and as, advancing into years, he looked back upon his past life, he surveyed with calm amusement many a struggle against (as he thought) fate and impossibility into which his youthful impatience had betrayed him. He observed, that his own efforts to correct his faults had never answered when they were untimely. And the same law applied to the treatment of

---

<sup>1</sup> Shelley's Alastor.

evil in others too. 'When I was a young preacher, I seriously 'meditated making all mankind good;' but I have found out my mistake, he adds. So, when he was a young monk, he fretted himself at the injustice he saw going on all around him; but now he saw that injustice always had gone on, and always would go on in the world. He now, therefore, gave himself as little trouble as might be about the annoyances of life. 'What good 'would it do him to be vexing himself, for example, about the 'Sacramentaries and sectarians?' Thus, underneath a fatalist theory, an easy good nature grew and expanded; and warm sympathies, and a fascinating presence, had their full play. Bitter as wormwood to his foes, Luther was all heart and love to friends and those who went along with him. Let it only appear that a man had joined him, or made himself at all his dependant, and his generosity was boundless. Thus the genial liberality with which he relieved the crowds of poor students who came to his door, parting even with the accidental ornament off his table, the present of some prince, for money to give them. Thus the attention with which he would listen to poor people, with their stories of supernatural troubles and foes. An old lansknecht 'complained to him of the manner in which the devil 'constantly assailed him with temptations and threats of carrying him through the air.' 'A young farrier, had been giving 'out in the neighbourhood that he was haunted by a spectre. 'Luther sent for the young man.' Thus the social evenings at the 'Black Eagle at Wittenberg,' where amidst the rounds of the cup the 'Table-talk' was produced. The jovial and hearty equality on which he puts himself with others, endeared him to companions, as his compassion and charity did to his class of poor friends. Wholly without the airs of a great man, free as air, easy and welcome as home, he radiated social heartiness and comfort; and men were happy round him, as they are happy round a fire. The music of his tongue, the brilliancy and fertility of his humour, and all his social gifts and talents, delightful in themselves, were more delightful because they were his; and the dispenser of rich treats was himself the great treat of all. The unpretending plainness of his whole way of living, always bordering on actual poverty and want, but borne with the most cheerful indifference, was a constant memento in his favour. The leader of the age and the adviser of princes, affecting no station and courting no great men, was externally one of the common crowd, and the plainest of it. In domestic life, the same heart and nature appear. There he overflows with affection, warmth, tenderness; with all the amiable banter of the husband, and all the sweet arts and pretty nonsense of a father among his little children. Whether he is joking, soothing, lecturing his 'rib

Catharine,' his 'gracious dame Catharine,' or writing a description of fairyland and horses with silver saddles to his 'voracious, bibacious, loquacious' little John, or whether he is in the agony of grief over the deathbed of his favourite daughter Margaret, we see the same exuberant tender character. In his love of outward nature the same exuberance and liveliness appear. There is a quick poetical sensibility to the productive powers of nature, and the earth's fertility and verdure. The 'beautiful bough loaded with cherries' appealed to him; the amazing effects of spring, as he walked in his garden, raised overpowering emotion. 'Glory to God, who, from the dead creation, thus raises up life again in the spring-time. Behold these branches, how strong, how beautiful they are! Already they teem, and are big with the fruit which they will bring forth. They offer a beautiful image of the resurrection of all men. The winter season represents death; the summer-tide the resurrection. Then all things live again, all is verdant.' Thus a shower was delightful to him; it had a productive renovating power. 'A very violent storm occurred, followed by beneficent showers, which restored verdure to the trees and the earth. Dr. Martin, turning his eyes towards heaven, said: "How lovely is this weather! Thou hast granted to us, O Lord, this bounty, to us who are so ungrateful to thee, so full of wickedness and avarice. But thou art a God of goodness! This is no work of the devil! No; it is a bounteous thunder which shakes the earth and rouses it, cleaving it, that its fruits may come forth and spread a perfume like to that which is diffused by the prayer of a pious Christian."'

There is a peculiar play of fancy and humour, again, in his love of nature, which reminds us strongly of the fancy and humour of the modern German; and as he listens to the rooks at Wartburg, and imagines them holding a parliament, and debating, the picture of the grave black senators seems almost prophetic of the pages of Andersen. Luther's love of music was part of the same character. 'Music was the art of the prophets, and ranked next to theology; music alone could calm the agitations of the soul and put the devil to flight.' Too deep a lover of music to regard it as a mere amusement to the listener, accomplishment to the performer, he associated it with mind and moral feeling, and made it part of religion. He entered into the beauty of the world of sound, in the same deep sympathetic way in which he entered into the beauty of the world of sight. His taste for the arts and the *belles lettres*, from his early affection for Virgil and Plautus, to his acquaintance with Lucas Cranach, and the criticisms on languages, grammar, Latin writing, the drama, painting, universities, and education, in the

Table-talk, show the enlarged sympathy which says, *Nihil humanum a me alienum puto*.

But with all this richness and warmth of social and poetical nature in Luther, there was too evident a deficiency of that one spirit which could chasten and temper it. That one pledge of safety named above is wanting. While we admire the fulness of the domestic sensibilities in him, it is impossible to forget how he dealt with the first of the domestic relations; and the sermon *De Matrimonio*, and the licence to Philip of Hesse, haunt us at his very fireside. The domestic sympathies require a regimen; and home, if it is a sweet and welcome, should be a severe and sanctified place. Did Luther provide for that side of home? It cannot be said that he did. Without fastening on him all the logical consequences of his matrimonial theory, some looseness of feeling must be seen underneath it. The model of a severe Christian home could hardly have been in the mind of a man who preached that sermon, and gave that license. The naked claim of nature demanding the lawful lawlessly, speaks in that sermon and the Table-talk. The rude invasion of a sacred blessing was hardly not suggestive of a self-willed and light treatment of the blessing itself; and Luther laid the foundation of his social and domestic temple ominously. A zeal for Old Testament precedent might urge the punishment of death for violations of matrimonial law, but his legislation did not guard itself from within, and by its own spirit. He unsettled men's minds, and set them wandering. Invidious as the remark may seem, a loose, unguarded spirit lay underneath the Lutheran social and domestic type, ready to betray it and corrupt it as time ran on; and a too luxuriant fulness tended from the beginning to disease. The fault of his moral exemplar again appeared, only in another shape, in his theological; unguardedness in feeling, become irreverence in religion; and underneath the poetical and sympathetic character lurked the sceptical one, which rejected parts of Scripture. A natural melancholy completes the picture, and throws a dark shade over its luxuriance and glow.

Luther was a German. His character, combining warmth with looseness, and poetry with scepticism, betrays strongly the German type. With every natural gift and feeling in profusion, he wanted one quality, and that want is the want of moral and religious Germany at this day. Not chargeable, personally, with all the development of German feeling and intellect since his time, he nevertheless stands before us too clearly as the exemplar, which that development has carried out and expanded. Not the absolute originator of the German character, he is yet its striking and prophetic

representative; the personifier of the nation. Luther himself half felt this position. It was his pride that he was a German, and he gloried in the conscious impulse he was giving to German intellect, character, and language. 'I was born for the good of my dear Germans,' he said, 'and I will never cease to serve them. 'The German language was superior to all others:' the Germans themselves 'were more honest, right, and true,' than all other people. 'We are all jolly fellows, we Germans; we eat, and drink, and sing, and break our glasses, and lose, at one sitting, an hundred or a thousand florins.' He knew the German character, and he sympathised with it in all its parts; he impersonated it with that truth and genuineness which sympathy supplies; and he has had that influence over it which a striking impersonation must have. Germany, in looking up to him, has always seen herself, and has been flattered and emboldened by the image. He has fixed national tendencies which might otherwise have wavered, and he has given consistency to impulses and direction to tastes. He has given her a great man, of whom she is proud; and all parts of the German mind exult in him. Students sing his songs at table, and congregations his hymns in church. Luther's Commentaries, and Luther's Table-talk, fasten on their respective disciples: and German piety, mirth, poetry, affection; German genius and industry; German enthusiasm and scepticism; German light-heartedness and melancholy, all see themselves reflected in their comprehensive prototype.

Another and still wider sphere of Luther's influence remains. Besides having an *ἦθος*, he had a dogma, and that dogma has covered a much larger ground than the national one of Germany.

When, in the commencement of this article, we gave an account of the formation and nature of the Lutheran dogma of justification by faith, we gave it in the full and extreme aspect of its formal and definite statement: we took Luther's own theological account of his own dogma. It was necessary to do this, because the formal account of a thing, if it is not itself the true and genuine one, is always suggestive, more or less, of that which is. It is always significant and speaking. But we are anxious now, before concluding, to exchange the more formal aspect of that dogma for a more practical one; though, in doing this, we are compelled, at the same time, to assign one great reason for it, which will, at first sight, look more severe than considerate. Formally and literally stated, then, the Lutheran dogma of justification by faith is so inconsistent with the first principles of common sense and natural religion, that, in this shape, no human being can possibly believe it. It requires us to believe

that that which makes a man pleasing to God, or justifies him, has nothing to do with morality or goodness in him; and, being moral creatures, we cannot believe this. Luther himself could not believe it, or mean practically to teach it; and, therefore, the question remains,—What was the truth he practically taught?

What Luther practically taught, then, in the dogma of justification *without* works, seems to have been a particular view against formality, accuracy, and anxiety *in* works. It was a view antagonistic to an existing and authoritative one. He saw, he tells us, much narrow punctilious formalism in the lives and practice of Christians of his day; he had observed its effects upon the minds of many religious persons, monks, and others; and could testify that it debilitated and distorted, instead of strengthening and really disciplining, them. He speaks of death-beds he had seen, where the results of this system were most unfavourable; the fact being quite apparent that individuals had gained no real Christian principle or faith by it, whatever amount of self-denial they had in their own way undergone. Nor are we at liberty to deny all credit to such testimony. To such a narrowly scrupulous formal view of works, then, Luther opposed himself; but he opposed it in his usual extreme and extravagant way. Not content with correcting a narrow anxiety, he aimed at clearing away all anxiety whatever. He would fain have relieved absolutely the human mind of its burden, and divested the whole idea of duty of that salutary oppressiveness and fear which is essential to it.

The great cause of fear and anxiety in connexion with works is, the idea of their conditional place in the process of justification. A man who says to himself, I must perform such and such works, in order to stand well in God's sight, or be a justified person, is necessarily anxious and scrupulous about performing those works. On the contrary, if a man is justified, or is in God's favour without works, then whatever other place or subsequent importance may be assigned to works, he feels tolerably easy about them: the anxious point is passed, and he can afford to take his leisure. This was the arrangement, then, which the Lutheran dogma of justification made.<sup>1</sup> Not deny-

<sup>1</sup> 'Hoc ideo curiosius observandum, ne errorem erremus, quem Lutherus, et post eum nostratum theologorum plerique, in disputationibus suis de justificatione contra pontificios, nimio contradicendi aestu abrepti, in ecclesias reformatas maximo earum malo invexerant: sc. evangelium ex puris putis promissis constare; Christum dedisse mundo legem nullam; id tantum egisse, ut legem prius latam exponeret, atque a pessimis Scribarum ac Phariseorum commentis assereret; legis moralis usum eum nunc esse unicum, ut per ipsam homines ad fidem Christi adducantur, vel saltem ut sit *arbitraria quædam vivendi regula, a Christo quidem nobis commendata, cui obtemperare ex gratitudine teneamur, nequaquam vero sub*



ing all place to good works, Luther deprived them of their conditional place; he took from them all contemporary action in the process of justification, and gave them a subsequent one. 'I allow,' he says, 'that good works also are to be inculcated, but in their own time and place: that is to say, when we are out of this capital article of justification.' 'I, too, say, that faith without works is null and void;' but not, he adds, 'that faith has its solidity from its works, but only that it is adorned by them.' *Christiani non fiunt justi operando justa, sed jam justificati operantur justa.* Wholly irrelevant to the understanding as may be the distinction here drawn between—the necessity of good works being acknowledged—their necessity prior to and subsequent to the act of justification; practically, we see a meaning and a difference. The one view practically attaches less anxiety to good works than the other does. It allows the mind, reposing upon a justification already past and complete, to proceed to good works as a sort of becoming and decorous appendage of that state. Thus set at ease, the Christian can, if he likes, fall back upon an easier and more casual and secular class of good works; and Luther advises him not to be spiritually ambitious. 'There is no such great difference between a good Christian and a good citizen, in the matter of works. The works of the Christian are in appearance mean. He does his duty according to his calling; governs the state, rules his house, tills his field, does good to his neighbour.'<sup>1</sup> Such appears to be the practical upshot and meaning of Luther's dogma. Not absolutely denying the fundamental truth of natural religion, that man should do good works, the practical doctrine

*periculo animæ, aut tanquam conditio Novi Fœderis ad salutem observatu necessaria, nobis imposita.* Ex his principiis, incautius ab iis positis, atque a theologorum vulgo avide arreptis, per necessariam consequentiam deducta fluxerunt execrabilia Antinomorum, Libertinorum, Familistarum atque ejusdem farinae aliorum dogmata, de quibus fortasse boni illi viri ne per somnium quidem cogitarunt. Verum utut sit, qui talia docent et tamen in Libertinos magnis clamoribus vociferantur, quid aliud agunt, quam ut, dum illos damnant, seipsos condemnent? Quippe in præmissas consentiunt, conclusionem tantum respuunt. Ut huic pessimo errori obviam eatur, illud pro certo statuendum est, Christum in concione a Matthæo, &c. &c.—*Bull, Harmonia Apostolica, Dissert. Prior, p. 40.*

<sup>1</sup> 'Nec ita magnum est discrimen inter Christianum et hominem civiliter bonum. Nam opera Christiani in speciem vilia sunt. Facit officium juxta vocationem suam, gubernat rempublicam, regit domum, colit agrum, consulit, largitur, et servit proximo. Ea opera carnalis homo non magnificat, sed putat esse vulgaria et nihili, quæ laici, imo gentiles, etiam faciant. Mundus enim non percipit ea quæ Spiritus Dei sunt, ideo perverse judicat de operibus piorum. Monstrosam illam hypocritarum superstitionem, et eorum electitia opera, non solum admirat, sed etiam religiose de eis sentit, et ea magnis impensis fovet. Contra piorum opera (in speciem quidem vilia et exilia tamen vero bona et accepta Deo cum fiant in fide, lætitia animi, obedientia, et gratitudine erga Deum) tantum abest ut agnoscat esse bona, ut etiam vituperet et damnet ea, tanquam summam impietatem et injustitiam.'—*Comment. in Gal. Opp., vol. v. p. 377.*

makes the distinction between one class of works and another, and one mode of doing them and another.

This dogma of justification, then, has unquestionably had an important and influential career ; and Luther has succeeded in impressing an idea very deeply and fixedly upon a theological posterity. It covers all Protestant Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway ; it has always had, and has now, a considerable reception within our own Church. Its effects are too apparent ; and wherever the idea of works, as mere appendages to a state of justification, extends, it is seen to ease anxiety about them : a popular view of their practical unimportance arises, and displaces them as regular marks by which Christians are to be distinguished from the world. It is difficult to over-estimate the power of a dogma which brings to a point, and concentrates in one definite and portable distinction, a whole mass of vague thought and inclination, existing at large in human nature. With a basis of such a kind to support it, the pointed statement lays marvellous hold upon minds, penetrates them, and becomes their central informing principle. Our divines, as a body, have, indeed, done their duty with respect to this idea, and have exposed its one-sidedness and hollowness, its opposition to Scripture and to reason, and they have prevented English Lutheranism, or Calvinism, though it has gained extensive influence, from getting predominance. To one, more especially, the English Church owes her thanks, one whose exceeding clearness, vigour, and solidity, though running into occasional prolixity and minuteness, is well adapted to defend the truths of reason and Scripture. In the pages of Bishop Bull we are in a world of substance and reality, by the side of which the theology he was opposing appears like a dream. But the Lutheran dogma goes on, being the comfort and stay, the one Christian creed, the one religion of many minds. For the long continuance of such an idea it would be vain to attempt any philosophical account. We see the facts before us, and must be mainly content with them. It would be still more idle to prophecy than to explain. The Lutheran dogma, however, can only stand by the suppression of a large part of Scripture ; and it seems reasonable to expect that any part of Scripture which is violently overborne must vindicate itself at last.

- ART. V.—1. *The British Chaplaincy in Madeira.* By VISCOUNT CAMPDEN. Reprinted, with additions, from 'The Theologian and Ecclesiastic,' for November, 1847. London: W. J. Cleaver. 1847.
2. *A Brief Statement of Facts with regard to the British Chaplaincy at Madeira.* Funchal. 1846.
3. *Correspondence between the Lord Bishop of London, the Chaplain, and the Congregation of the British Church established in Madeira.* London: Hatchard. 1846.
4. *A Letter to R. Stoddart, Esq., Her Britannic Majesty's Consul at Madeira.* By S. CALVERLY BEWICKE, Esq. Funchal. 1846.
5. *Correspondence between the Rev. T. Sapcey, of Oswestry, Salop, Her Britannic Majesty's Consul at Madeira, R. Stoddart, Esq., and the Rev. H. Landon.* Funchal. 1847.

THERE are few parts of the world in which the good and bad qualities of the English nation have been more curiously exemplified than in the Island of Madeira, to which we must for a short time call the attention of our readers. To begin with the favourable side; we consider it a high and peculiar distinction that it is not a British colony. For nearly 200 years, since the re-establishment of the independence of Portugal, the mother country has leaned upon British aid. During this whole period England has maintained her supremacy at sea. In a large part of it her peculiar craving seemed to be for the extension of her colonial and specially her insular empire. Yet while it would be difficult to estimate the expenditure which we have incurred in defence of Portugal, we believe that it has never been proposed that this island should be ceded as a very inadequate compensation. We do not think it would be easy to show an instance in the history of any other people of conduct so liberal and magnanimous towards a wholly helpless ally. We know from history what has been the usual result of alliance between the strong and the weak. Greek democracy, Roman aristocracy, French kingdom and empire, have exhibited them in turn. Here we see the peculiar honour of England. And it has been shown also in the high character and position of many of our principal merchants, whose houses of standing extending now beyond the memory of man, have made Funchal, in truth, a British factory, and exhibited British energy, per-

severance, and integrity, in the most marked contrast to the failings of our faithful allies. So far well. Meanwhile, in this British factory, we find the English church so much a stranger that her House of Prayer was erected only in 1823. Until very lately we might have found the services of that Church so much corrupted, that an English Churchman could hardly have recognised the Church of his fathers. We find the British factory divided against itself into a number of sects, which as recapitulated by Lord Campden are really quite startling. As if to complete the miniature picture of English society, we find the epidemic ecclesiastical diseases of the day imported in their worst forms into the factory, and contending there with the Church of England, which seems also to have put on there her brightest apparel. We find the notorious Dr. Kalley boasting himself (with characteristic equivocation) 'a member of *the Churches of England*,' while in truth, he has been first, we believe, an independent, then a member of the Scotch establishment, and now of the Free Kirk (see *Christian Remembrancer* for April, 1846), harbouring himself under the insulted name of the Church of England while busy in making converts from the National Church to his own sect. Not to dwell on his disgraceful history, we have it followed up by the sad dissensions in the Church of England congregation of Funchal, to which we are now to call the attention of our readers, and in which the scenes which we have lately witnessed in England seem to have been caricatured; the supporters of the Church exhibiting an unusual degree of earnestness, moderation, respect for authority, firmness, and patience under outrage; while the assailants seem to have betrayed an unusual spirit of virulence, persecution, and unscrupulousness; and at the same time the British Government, we regret to say, has conducted itself as little to its credit, as in any instance with which we are acquainted.

Before detailing any particulars of the Madeira controversy, we must remind our readers of some circumstances in the position of the English Church abroad. We are not purposing to examine the state of things which warrants, because it compels, the formation of English churches in countries, where the Catholic Church is indeed in possession, but where her rulers refuse to admit English Churchmen to their communion except upon condition of renouncing obedience to the Church of England. This state of things we admit to be anomalous, and we can defend it only as a temporary expedient to meet a present need. While it lasts, however, it becomes us to be doubly careful that in exercising so extreme a right, and discharging functions so irregular, the Church of England shall never forget or conceal her true character and claims. This is the more

necessary, because in most of those countries there are heretical sects, which falsely indeed, but pertinaciously, claim kindred with her, on the ground of a common protest against the Roman supremacy; and even where the whole native population is in external commerce with the Catholic Church (Greek or Roman), there are to be found English subjects members of the many sects which beset us at home, and who, being entitled to all the rights of Englishmen, are not unwilling to claim and assume, in that character, privileges which belong to us, not as Englishmen but as members of the Church.

Under such circumstances it becomes even more important in foreign countries than it is at home, that our administration of Church affairs should be in all respects regular and Catholic; that every officiating priest should feel himself, and be recognised by others (whether 'within' or 'without' the pale of the English Church), to be authorized not by himself, nor by his congregation, nor by the civil government, but by the Church and by the Bishop as her representative; that the services and rites of our common faith should be solemnized regularly, seriously, devoutly, and, therefore, in one word, according to the rules of the Church, not after the caprice of individuals.

The course actually adopted to secure these ends is as follows: British congregations abroad are to be distinguished into two classes, those which are established in factories where there is a resident consul, and which are recognised by the civil government; and those which exist in towns where the British residents, though often far more numerous, are mere sojourners without these advantages.

We shall not now enter at large into the latter case, to which, however, we have before this called attention, and shall probably take occasion to do so again. Few steps, we fear, have been taken to prevent abuses in the British congregations of such towns: at least we have yet to learn what they are. We believe the arrangements at present to be these, that any clergyman, or any other person not in orders, or not a member of the Church, is at full liberty to open a place of worship in any town where the English congregate, and give himself out as the representative of the Church of England—that (as there are many places where numbers of English reside, more or less permanently, without any chaplain at all) such a person, if he select his place judiciously, is pretty sure to obtain a congregation and something like a maintenance adequate or otherwise. It sometimes happens that an adventurer, ordained or not, is hired by some speculator (the practice is not limited to the tribe of Dan) to become his priest, when he is desirous to attract English visitors to some watering place; and in this case he becomes part of the staff in common

with the keepers of the gambling tables, and the waiters at the 'tables d'hôte,' and the leaders of the band. In other instances men who have left England from necessity, or debt, or loss of character, or failure of health, have found congregations willing to assemble round them, and have officiated at their own risk. It follows that, as many of these accidents are common to the evil and the good, both extremes of character, and many of the intermediate shades, are to be found among our foreign chaplains. Nay, in one town we have known an exemplary clergyman to officiate for years, having been driven from England by failing health, and then an opposition Church was opened by an adventurer, who in that case, as it happened, ended his days as the object of the charity of the man to whom he would fain have been rival.

For all this there seems but one remedy, however difficult its application might be, at least in many instances. Those who officiate abroad ought to have some acknowledged and public credential from the Church at home. Without this no clergyman should be allowed to undertake pastoral care abroad, on pain of losing his privileges at home as a clergyman of the Church. The result would be, that no respectable person, really in holy orders, would be found willing to dispense with the proposed credential; and as soon as that end was attained the British residents abroad would feel, (what they cannot now feel, for it is not the case,) that the character of any man who attempted to officiate without it would not bear investigation.

To turn to the consular stations (of which Madeira is one), the case is different. The chaplains here are public functionaries nominated by the Crown, which contributes in part to their support, and holding a licence from the Bishop of London. And yet, even here, there is much to regret.

The Church affairs of these stations are regulated by an Act of Parliament, 6 Geo. IV. cap. 87, and by certain regulations issued by Lord Palmerston, as secretary of state, under the authority of that act, and with a view to its more efficient operation. It is provided that 'at any foreign port or place in which a chaplain is now, or shall at any future time be, resident, and regularly employed in the celebration of divine service, according to the rules and ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland, or of the Church of Scotland, and maintained by voluntary subscriptions, &c.' the consul may be authorized by the secretary of state to contribute, at the expense of the Treasury, any such sums of money, not exceeding in any one year what has been raised by voluntary subscription, for the following purposes, or any of them—viz. (1) the maintenance of the chaplain; or (2) the expenses of divine service; or (3)



maintaining burial grounds; or (4) towards interments of her Majesty's subjects therein; or (5) the erection of Church or Hospital, or the procuring of burial-ground. The consul is further required to call meetings twice in the year of all subscribers to these purposes, and the general meetings shall have power to make regulations, &c., which shall not, however, be valid without the sanction of the consul, and ultimately of the secretary of state. These regulations are to be 'such as may be necessary for carrying into execution the objects of this Act, so far as relates to these measures, or any of them.' The meeting is also to elect a treasurer and two trustees, but these last have no power to take any unusual step, make any regulation, &c., without authority from the general meeting. In the general meeting all British subjects are qualified to vote if they have subscribed in all 20*l.* to the purposes mentioned in the Act; so that they have contributed 3*l.* (whether as part of the original 20*l.* or not) within the last year. The treasurer may not refuse a subscription from any British subject who desires to qualify himself. 'All chaplains of the Church of England who are appointed under this Act are, at the request of the secretary of state, licensed by the Bishop of London, and are to consult the Bishop of London in all spiritual matters, and to obey his orders thereupon.' 'One chaplain only can be attached to each Church to which an allowance is granted,' and 'the Act of Parliament gives no power to the residents to interfere with the spiritual administration of the Church. This must be left to the chaplain. On the other hand the Act gives no power to the chaplain to interfere in the temporal administration of Church affairs. These matters must be left to the general meetings of the British residents.' 'Sacramental alms and oblations are to be distributed by the chaplain, and are not to be entered in the treasurer's account. The chaplain is nominated by her Majesty, through the secretary of state, and holds his office during her Majesty's pleasure, and no longer.'<sup>1</sup>

There are defects in this Act as interpreted by the regulations issued by Lord Palmerston, to which it will be necessary to call attention before we proceed to relate its practical administration in the Madeira case. It will be observed, that it is distinctly a Church Act; for although it includes other affairs than those strictly ecclesiastical (for example, the provision of hospitals for her Majesty's subjects), still it is so limited that it applies only to 'any foreign port or place in which a chaplain

---

<sup>1</sup> We believe this to be a fair abstract of the provisions. They are printed in the 'Brief Statement,' &c., pp. 7 to 17.

'is now or shall be resident.' Evidently it is, no chaplain no act, no regulation, no government allowance. If there were British residents, British consul, British burial-ground, British hospital, yet, without a resident chaplain, this act cannot be applied at all. This being the case, it is a glaring defect that the qualification for voting in the 'general meetings,' in which all the temporal affairs of the Church are to be settled, is merely one of money. Any man, be he bishop, priest, or deacon, churchman, or dissenter, or Roman Catholic, heretic, or Jew, or professed infidel, so that he have the pecuniary qualification, is equal in these meetings. Thus the whole temporal administration of the Church may be in the hands of unbaptized or ex-communicate persons, and we shall see hereafter that this term 'temporal' is one capable of large application.

Again, although Lord Palmerston's 'regulations' say, that the chaplain is to be subject to the Bishop of London, this is not provided in the Act itself, which only prescribes his appointment by the Crown, and his tenure of office 'during pleasure, 'and no longer.' Thus the licence of the bishop may be set at nought, if such be the pleasure of any foreign secretary. A clergyman might legally be appointed whom the bishop refused to license, and one whom he highly approved, and whose licence he refused to revoke, might legally be displaced by the civil power. Be it here remembered that the foreign secretary need not be a member of the Church; and that Lord Aberdeen, Sir R. Peel's secretary (of whom we shall hear more before long), is actually a presbyterian. We understand that the English bishops refuse to license the chaplains of unions, because they are liable to be displaced, without their consent, by the Board of Guardians. The chaplains appointed under this act are in the same legal position—we say *legal*, because, in fact, no attempt has ever been made by any government to recall a chaplain who holds the bishop's licence, and (notwithstanding the evident hopes of the anti-church party in Madeira,) we cannot believe that any thing so indecent will be attempted. It is plain, however, that the law should be altered so far at least, that the whole administration of Church affairs may be in those who are really and *bond fide*, as well as in profession, members of the Church; and that the chaplain, once appointed, should be irremovable, except upon the revocation of his licence by the bishop. Other changes in the actual administration of things are no less necessary; but as we have no doubt that they result, not from faults in the law itself, but from the misinterpretation of it by the Foreign Office, we have not included them in this list. They will come before us in the sequel.

And now let Lord Campden relate the origin of the Church controversy in Madeira:—

' In 1833, Mr. Lowe was appointed to the chaplaincy by Lord Palmerston, at the unanimous request of the British residents in the island; Lord Palmerston having previously referred to the Bishop of London, and received most satisfactory statements from him respecting Mr. Lowe. The Bishop then gave Mr. Lowe his licence, in virtue of which Mr. Lowe has from that time officiated as chaplain. At the time of his appointment, the state of the English congregation at Madeira was at the lowest ebb: service was performed only once on Sunday, and then abbreviated and altered, in direct opposition to the order of the Church. Prayers were omitted, lessons altered, baptisms irregularly performed, the Holy Eucharist administered only four times a year, and even then no alms collected at the offertory. The catalogue of irregularities might easily be extended, but sufficient have been stated. Mr. Lowe commenced from the first gradually to bring the services up to the proper standard prescribed by order of the Church, till he had established a double daily service, weekly communions, offertorial collections on Sundays and other holy days, baptisms in the Church—restored all the omitted prayers, and a due observance of the great festivals and days appointed to be kept holy. In this salutary course he proceeded for eleven years uninterrupted, to the edification of his flock, and the manifest improvement of religion, and the state of morals and society among the English in the island. In 1844 commenced an unjustifiable opposition to him, which has been carried on up to the present time, and still continues with increasing bitterness and hatred. In the end of that year nine visitors to the island made a charge against his "teaching," and specified four objectionable sermons, three of which sermons half of the objectors had not heard—indeed it is believed they were not in the island when the sermons were preached! This charge was embodied in a memorial to the Bishop against Mr. Lowe. It was immediately met by a counter-memorial, made by nine other visitors to Madeira, vindicating the orthodoxy of the chaplain, and denying the preaching of any sermons contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England. The memorial and counter-memorial were forwarded to the Bishop of London, and copies also of the sermons in question were sent to him by Mr. Lowe. In due time an answer was received from the Bishop, stating that there was no doctrine put forth in any of the sermons which was at variance with the doctrine of the English Church, and expressing himself satisfied, from his knowledge of Mr. Lowe for several years past, that he "is justly entitled to their (the counter-memorialists) respect and affection." Here then was the first objection raised against Mr. Lowe, and deservedly did it meet with a signal failure. The unfortunate interference of nine discontented visitors, however, stirred up a flame most difficult to be quenched. Had it not been for this unhappy circumstance, matters would in all probability have gone on quietly as usual, as they had been going on for the past eleven years, and the peace of the Church there would have remained undisturbed; to these nine, then, primarily belongs the responsibility of all the sad scenes, heart-burnings, and contentions that have followed.

' In the spring of 1845, twenty-nine of the permanent residents, incited thereto by what has just been stated, made a request to Mr. Lowe to return to the same manner of performing Divine Service as when he first undertook the duty. To this he replied in an able and temperate letter, stating the reasons why it was impossible for him to do so, saying that he was bound to obey the orders of the Church, and that the only way to avoid any irregularity in the service was to regulate it according to the directions of

the Rubrics, which afforded an invariable rule to follow, and to obey which he was solemnly obliged by his ordination vows, and to the following of which rule he had adhered for many years without any expressed dissatisfaction on the part of his congregation. This did not satisfy them, and the treasurer and two trustees of the chapel proceeded, as they profess, in the name of those who made the application (although no authority has ever been shown which gave them this power; and it is remarkable, that more than one of the applicants withdrew from all further proceedings, being convinced of their unfairness), to address the Bishop of London, specifying nine points of complaint against Mr. Lowe for his method of performing Divine Service, and otherwise entering into incorrect charges against him.

This letter having been communicated to Mr. Lowe, was received by him with so much gentleness, that he even told the writers that he thought six of the points mentioned 'might easily be arranged,' if they would yield their objections on three, which he felt he could not conscientiously give up.

This offer being refused by the complainants, their letter went, and in due course his lordship's reply arrived. With admirable patience he discusses the complaints—some false, some frivolous, some against practices in adopting which Mr. Lowe had evidently no alternative, and at last he leaves Mr. Lowe at liberty to concede to them these four points:—

- '1. Preaching in the surplice.
  - '2. Singing the Communion Hymns.
  - '3. Reading every Sunday the Exhortation.
  - '4. Walking at funerals from the church to the burial-ground in the surplice.' (Cor. p. 42.)
- 'thus showing his promptitude and willingness to gratify them, 'to the 'furthermost limit of allowed concession.'—*Lord Campden*, p. 11.

So grave were the questions for which the British Church in Madeira was to be thrown into flames! The Bishop remarks:

'These are all the charges of which complaint is made, and I have now considered them one by one. I am extremely sorry that differences should have arisen between Mr. Lowe and any portion of his congregation, on matters, some of which are confessedly of trifling importance *in themselves*, but which Mr. Lowe considers to involve the principle of obedience to rules, which he has solemnly promised to observe.

'Whatever practice is not enjoined by these rules, or sanctioned by general custom, I advise him to lay aside, if by so doing he can satisfy the scruples of those persons who are really members of our Church; but I cannot, with any consistency, urge him to disregard those rules where they are plain and positive; although I might not think it necessary to press compliance with them in those instances where the non-observance of them has received a certain degree of sanction from general and long-prevailing custom, acquiesced in by the rulers of the Church.

'Those persons who desire to have the advantage of the services of the Church in all their completeness, according to the Church's express directions, would have reason to complain if they were curtailed or altered; and it appears there are many such persons in Mr. Lowe's congregation; and when a question arises, whether he shall comply with the wishes of those who would have him *disobey* the Church's rules (which he has promised to

observe), or of those who desire that he should *follow* them, it seems but reasonable that he should incline to the latter rather than to the former; and it would be manifestly wrong in me, whose duty it is to take care that these rules are observed, to urge upon him an opposite course of proceeding.

‘I have only to add an expression of my earnest hope that Mr. Lowe will perform (as I have reason to believe he *does* perform) all his ministrations with meekness and charity, as well as with punctuality and correctness, and that his congregation will receive them in the same spirit.’—*Correspondence*, &c. pp. 36-40.

The points on which the Bishop refused to permit the faithful members of the Church to be sacrificed to the agitators, were the use of the Prayer for the Church Militant, and the weekly offertory. As far as we can see, these points form the pretext, not of course the real cause, of all the subsequent agitation. But the Bishop's answer contained other remarks which were naturally galling to the complainants; he administered, says Lord Campden ‘a severe rebuke to those who, upon their own showing, had ceased to attend the English chapel, and repaired ‘to a Dissenting meeting-house, because they disapproved of ‘Mr. Lowe. He said, “that those persons who have resorted ‘to this extreme measure, without waiting to learn the result ‘of an appeal to me, can hardly claim to be heard as members of ‘our Church, on the subject of the present complaint.”’—(p. 7.)

The next step of the complainants was, that of succeeding in obtaining a majority of votes in the general meeting, the function of which is strictly limited to the ‘temporal affairs of the Church.’ They explained these by refusing to allow any salary to be paid, either to the chaplain, organist, doorkeeper, or pew-opener. Having voted this by a tyrant majority, one of them boasted, ‘well, at all events, we have got rid of Mr. Lowe.’ But behold the chaplain refused to resign, and the Churchmen in Madeira subscribed, in a few days, £300, which was paid to him instead of the £200 refused by the meeting. But the chaplain has been the sufferer by this exchange, for whereas, the secretary of state through the consul, had hitherto allowed a sum equal to that voted by the meeting, Lord Aberdeen, and subsequently Lord Palmerston, have refused to pay anything, although there is still a chaplain, and he is still maintained by voluntary contributions of Churchmen.

Meanwhile it seemed clear that any Churchman had a right to require the elected treasurer to receive his subscription for any one of the purposes mentioned in the Act, and therefore subscriptions were tendered to him ‘for the payment of the chaplain.’ These he refused, being a strong partizan of the complainants, on the pretext that the meeting had decided that no payment should be made to the chaplain, and in this palpably

illegal refusal he was supported by the consul and the secretary of state.

Time passed on however, and the usual meeting again took place in January, 1847. There was an evident objection to Churchmen qualifying themselves to vote at this meeting, for if the salary were successfully refused, they must still support their chaplain; while, on the other hand, if the complainants increased their strength by qualifying new members, and succeeded in refusing it, the money subscribed was still to be disposed by their own votes; and when they had (as they hoped) got rid of their present pastor, the accumulation would only remain in hand to supply future years, and prevent the necessity of their subscribing again. Besides this, the opponents of the Church had another great advantage. In order to qualify any British subject to vote, his subscription must be paid to the Treasurer. Now the treasurer was the creature and nominee of the complainants. It was therefore perfectly well known to the opponents of the Church how many voters were qualified to vote in defence of the Church, but the Churchmen knew nothing of the strength of their adversaries until they met in the Consular residence. They came sanguine of success, for they were, notwithstanding all difficulties, twenty in number, and the majority of the year before was only thirteen in all. (See 'Brief Statement,' page 5). To their astonishment, however, they found the room thronged with thirty-five voters, seventeen of whom at least must have qualified themselves, at the expense of 20*l.* each, for the express purpose of attending to vote against any application of the money subscribed for the maintenance of the British Church in Madeira, whether by themselves or their opponents. Lord Campden says:—

'And this (it is currently believed) by the aid of money obtained out of the island: persons well acquainted with the opponents considering that none of them were in such a position as to be able to provide the sum of £300<sup>1</sup> which was expended in qualifying them as voters.'—P. 16.

Again, therefore, the payment of the chaplain and the necessary expenses of the church were refused, and to make this refusal more marked, the majority proceeded to vote a salary to a gardener for keeping the grounds round the church in order.

But all this would not remove Mr. Lowe, who held his office by the appointment of the Crown and the licence of the Bishop, although the meeting at the consul's house, and the foreign secretary had combined to deprive him of his salary.

<sup>1</sup> Is it possible that this money was really paid, or was there any collusion between the voters and the treasurer?



The malcontents, therefore, tried another plan to effect their object. They held another meeting in May last, at which they addressed Her Majesty, 'to remove the cause of the dissatisfaction,' to remove the chaplain for not disobeying the orders of the Bishop of London, to which (to speak of no higher obligation), he was bound to render obedience, by the express orders of Her Majesty's secretary of state, under which he was nominated to the chaplaincy. When this request was made, it is to be observed, that the chaplain held his office both by appointment from the Crown and by licence from the Bishop, and that no charge of any kind had ever been brought against him, except those addressed to the Bishop of London, and answered, as we have seen. The meetings which refused his salary, had, in each instance, refused to assign any reason for doing so. Their motive was obvious; for the meeting has no spiritual authority by the very regulations of Lord Palmerston himself, and the only pretext for these measures was, that Mr. Lowe had taken his directions, in matters purely spiritual, from the Bishop of London, not from the majority of the meeting.

What answer then was returned by the Government of England, to such a request from such parties? Did it receive any? Yes, strange to say, it was noticed. Then our readers will say, the secretary of state reproved those who ventured upon so immodest a request. Guess again. He replied, perhaps, that the Bishop had seen reason to withdraw Mr. Lowe's licence, and that Her Majesty had, therefore, recalled her appointment. That answer would have justified Lord Palmerston, no doubt, at the expense of the Bishop; but, alas, it could not be given. The licence stands good. Is it possible that Lord Palmerston displaced the chaplain in defiance of the Bishop? He did more, he defied the Bishop and the Queen, Church and State both. He wrote to the meeting, 'to elect a successor to Mr. Lowe'—the appointment of the Crown, and the licence of the Bishop remaining in force; and the appointment, even if the chaplaincy were vacant, being vested not in the meeting of subscribers, but in the Queen. Lord Campden proceeds:—

'As if to extend these insults to the Church at large, this act is still further perpetrated without any previous communication with the Bishop of London, by virtue of whose licence Mr. Lowe continues, un-recalled, to exercise his duties as chaplain! without the slightest intimation given beforehand to the Bishop or Mr. Lowe! And the first knowledge that the Churchmen have of it is at a meeting called in the beginning of May last, when the dispatch was read ordering this shameful proceeding—a dispatch which had been made known to many of the opposition, but up to the time of the meeting carefully concealed from the Churchmen! To

suppose for a moment that the Foreign Office would ever have made such an egregious mistake, or offered such a deliberate insult to the Church, is beyond all belief.

'We understand, that as soon as the knowledge of this extraordinary proceeding came to the ears of the Bishop, his Lordship was naturally very much surprised and annoyed, and protested to Lord Palmerston against it in the strongest manner—it was hoped with good effect, as Lord Palmerston was understood to have acknowledged that he could not decently appoint another chaplain, while the actual chaplain retained the Bishop's licence; and the Bishop, as was to be supposed, will not withdraw the licence, as he sees no ground whatever for doing so, and considers Mr. Lowe to have been cruelly ill-used and persecuted. Thus stands the matter at present. The Foreign Office has used tyranny worse than ever any Pope did, and its fiat has gone forth to appoint another chaplain. Meanwhile Mr. Lowe will not resign; he could not do so without yielding to the supremacy of the Foreign Office, and sacrificing all the great principles for which he has during the last three years been so nobly contending; and the Bishop does not withdraw his licence, but protests to the Government against such unbecoming proceedings on the part of the holders of power. May God defend the right. But Churchmen must be active, they must not slumber, they must be up and doing; they must give every support they can to this cause, which is the cause of the Church against tyranny; and justice may yet be obtained, and a victory won for the Church over her unscrupulous foes.

'The noble champion of this cause, the faithful Pastor of the English congregation in Madeira, must not be forgotten. He is fighting a glorious fight; and we trust, will meet with a due reward. He has sacrificed his personal comforts and convenience to his duty to the Church, his Bishop, and his flock. He remains in Madeira, to uphold the authority of the Bishop, the independence of Foreign Chaplains, the privileges of his faithful flock; and shall he be left unsupported? No! his cause is the cause of the Church at large; the principles of ecclesiastical discipline, and obedience to spiritual authority are at stake, and we do not doubt for a moment that all Churchmen in England will join in doing everything in their power, to support their Bishop in his lawful authority against the oppression of the State, to maintain in every way their good English chaplain in Madeira, and to vindicate the rightful and precious privileges of their brother Churchmen in that distant island.

'P.S.—Since the publication of this paper in the "Theologian and Ecclesiastic" of November, further accounts have been received of the continual aggressive proceedings of the malcontents. The consul had been absent in England a great part of the summer and autumn, during which time the faction remained quiescent; but immediately upon his return to Madeira, in the beginning of November, he is understood to have held a consultation with the treasurer and trustees, the result of which was that these persons requested a meeting to be summoned, at which they proceeded to resolve, that as they had received no further communication from Lord Palmerston, they would proceed to the further consideration of his Lordship's dispatch of April last, and recommend the Rev. Thomas Kenworthy Brown, Vicar of Easeby, to be appointed chaplain! An amendment was moved, very properly stating that such an act would be a transgression of the Act of Parliament, which vested the appointment solely in the hands of the Sovereign, through one of the secretaries of state; and, also, that in the present instance the chaplaincy was not vacant, but held by Mr. Lowe, against whom there were not, nor could be, any charges preferred. Of course the tyrant

faction, having a majority in the meeting (that they are a small minority out of it everybody knows), carried their resolution. It was, however, considered by well-judging persons to be only a desperate move on their part to retrieve the mistake they fell into at the meeting on the 6th of May, and a strong letter to the Bishop of London, condemning this resolution and the proceedings of the meeting, was immediately written, and signed by seventy-one communicants,—the number of communicants at Church just at that time being about seventy-eight. We grieve to say that much less decorum than usual was exhibited at this meeting, and that most unbecoming language was used against Mr. Lowe, and also against a *Clergyman* and *four ladies* present, to the great satisfaction of the majority;—and this was permitted, unchecked, it is feared, by the chairman. Sad, indeed, is the spectacle afforded by some of our fellow-countrymen abroad.

‘It is worthy of serious attention, that Mr. Brown, recommended by the malcontents, as the person to be hereafter exposed to the treatment always experienced by his predecessors, is almost unknown to them: to the minority, indeed, he was unknown, it is believed, even by name, till he was proposed at the meeting. But it is well understood that he was recommended to the malcontents by a clergyman, who had made secret accusations to the Bishop of London against Mr. Lowe,—from which accusations, however, Mr. Lowe triumphantly vindicated himself.

‘It can scarcely be supposed that Mr. Brown is cognizant of the true state of things, or he would surely hesitate before he commits himself to the false position of being the nominee of a party, and of endeavouring to supplant a brother clergyman in the allotted sphere of duty; neither can it be conceived that Mr. Brown would venture to go out to officiate without a licence from the Bishop, which he must be well aware he cannot obtain, the present chaplain being in possession of the Bishop of London’s licence, by virtue of which he officiates as English Chaplain to Madeira, and for the withdrawal of which his lordship has stated that no grounds exist.

‘It remains to be seen what notice this last resolution of the meeting will meet with at the Foreign Office, whether the feelings of the majority of the congregation, and the members of the Church will still be disregarded; and we trust that the propriety will be obvious of attending to the remonstrances of the Lord Bishop of London, who is, by Lord Palmerston’s own regulations, as well as by his episcopal office, the appointed judge in these matters, and to whose advice in the appointment of foreign chaplains, it is the custom of the Governments to look and defer.’—Pp. 20—23.

We have carried on the narrative to the present moment, that the course of events might be more clear, but we must now mention several important circumstances in explanation, which we have hitherto omitted.

It would be a great error to suppose this to be a contest between a clergyman and his flock; such a thing may sometimes occur without blame to the pastor, but Mr. Lowe’s trial, though severe, is of a much less painful kind. It is not a contest within the Church, but a persecution from without. Nothing is more impressed upon us in reading the narrative at the head of this article. The original complaint of December, 1844, which stirred up this strife, originated with a few (nine)

strangers; may they consider how they can answer to the Church and to God for the results of their step. With regard to the next complaint of the twenty-nine residents in the spring of 1845, Mr. Bewicke it seems informed the Bishop of London that the 'majority were dissenters.' This statement having been assailed, he replies:

'If I have misrepresented them I am sorry for it. Eleven of them held seats in their own names at another place of worship in the year 1845; others were either avowedly not members of the Church of England, (Correspondence, 66—71,) or so generally known as non-attendants at its services as to induce me in common charity to believe that they were attendants at some other place of worship. I was singularly unfortunate in the result of my inquiries at the time, if the majority of the twenty-nine complainants did not attend on a dissenting ministry.'—P. 4.

Lord Campden remarks that the complainants themselves, having occasion to speak to the Bishop of London, of the Church of England, call it neither *the Church*, nor even by a phrase common rather than reverend, *our Church*, but *YOUR CHURCH*, (See Correspondence, p. 51). The same gentlemen, as is also noticed by Lord Campden, complain of the custom of singing instead of reading the seraphic hymn in the Communion Service. Now we can imagine good Churchmen, who were, unfortunately, without taste for Church music, and as yet unaccustomed to it, annoyed at this practice; but it is certainly impossible that any one such individual should fail to know something of the words with which that glorious hymn is introduced in our Prayer Book. Alas for the complainants!—they send deliberately over some thousands of miles of salt water, a complaint to the Bishop that they are not allowed to say—'*THEN with Angels and Archangels.*' Could this mistake have been made by any one who had, even once, repeated the words?

To turn from these internal evidences—we find great complaints indeed of the Offertory; but, as the complaints proceed, the collections go on increasing. Lord Campden writes:—

'The Services and the weekly Communions were fully and satisfactorily attended, and, notwithstanding that the chapel only accommodates between four and five hundred persons, and that the influx of visitors of 1846 was very considerably less than in the previous year, and that during four or five months of summer and autumn the congregation is very small; upwards of £300 was collected during the year at the Offertory, being a larger amount than it had ever previously attained. This is a most gratifying circumstance, and a decisive proof of the genuine faith and piety of the great majority of the congregation.'—P. 15.

So strictly is it a persecution from without; neither is this persecution of a very scrupulous kind; for example:—

'An unworthy manœuvre has been practised to give a deserted appearance to the chapel. Many pews are hired, and locked up, by the mal-

contents, although every other seat in the chapel is filled, and many visitors are thus unable to procure sittings. One lady with a large family has been, during her temporary absence in England, deprived of those she has occupied for some years, although it was known that she wished to retain them: and she with her family are now left without seats. Another proof is thus added to the already numerous ones of the unscrupulous proceedings of the anti-Church party.'—*Lord Campden*, p. 23.

Such has been the case throughout; it has been the anti-Church party against the chaplain and congregation. There was no fear of a 'secessio plebis;' if the opposing party had all seceded, they would have left behind them not solitude but only peace. Much less would the religious character or respectability of the congregation have suffered. At the great meeting of January, 1847, in which the malcontents amounted to thirty-six, they numbered only five communicants, the minority of twenty being communicants without a single exception. But this was not all. The leader of the majority on that day was a professed Socinian, and the supporters of the Church could not but feel that they gained by the fact, for he was infinitely superior in propriety of behaviour to many of those who, because they belonged to no other religious society, called themselves, by courtesy, Churchmen. We have seen that the letter to the Bishop of London, condemning the last step of the majority in the pretended election of Mr. Brown, has just been signed by seventy-one communicants out of seventy-eight.<sup>1</sup>

But if there are few communicants among the majority, there are abundance of other elements of strength, which are quite wanting among the supporters of the chaplain; of the thirty-six, Lord Campden (who was present,) writes: 'Most were Dissenters of various denominations, Socinians, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, &c.; others, infidels, profligates, bankrupts (formerly outlawed,) &c.; and some professing members of the Church, who never attend service, others who attend but rarely.'—P. 16.

The consul, indeed, ruled every point as was desired by the opponents of the Church, even rejecting, at the vote of the majority, two protests tendered by the Church party, although he had expressed his own opinion that, according to precedent, a protest should be entered on the minutes. But then the consul is a Presbyterian. The secretary of state (Lord Aberdeen) approved of the proceedings of the consul and his majority, but

---

<sup>1</sup> The number at that moment; it is often much greater, but of course varies considerably, with the increase or diminution of the number of strangers in the island.

then his Lordship belongs to the same sect. It must be admitted that, for whatever reason, the Churchmen of Madeira and their chaplain have not, to use a common phrase, 'Christians of all 'denominations,' on their side. This may however be boasted by the complainants. For one of those who came before the Bishop of London to complain of practices, which though innocent in themselves, yet shocked their weak nerves, especially in these critical times, by their frightful proximity to the practices of the Roman Church—one of these pure and zealous Protestants, who has pursued Mr. Lowe through every meeting of the Church Committee, and every appeal to the Foreign Office and the press—belonged (will our readers believe it?) to the Church of Rome. It hardly seems to have been an idle vaunt of the Irish Reformation Society orator, who declared he would go to Rome, and make the Pope himself cry 'No Popery.'

From such a body it is not wonderful that the theology of the English Church obtains small favour. But the clerical members of the party at least should learn prudence from the unhappy fate of poor Mr. Salwey—we beg his pardon, 'The Rev. T. Salwey, of Oswestry, Salop;,' this gentleman, it seems, heard doctrines in Mr. Lowe's preaching so shocking, that he felt it his duty to write to the foreign secretary requesting that his name might be withdrawn from the protest sent to him against the proceedings of the assailants. For the same reason it seems that he supplied to the Presbyterian consul, a copy of a private letter addressed to him by a brother clergyman to dissuade him from that step, and which expressed a low estimate of the theological qualifications of the malcontent party. The letter thus supplied to the consul was soon published by the malcontents, and this led to a pamphlet, named at the head of our article, 'Correspondence between the Rev. T. Salwey, &c.,' in which the consul, who is most anxious to appear neuter, certainly does not shine. But our present affair is with Mr. Salwey, he seems to have been impelled to these somewhat unusual steps by the horror with which he regarded Mr. Lowe's doctrines, which was so strong as to lead him even to write to Lord Aberdeen that he 'differed conscientiously from the chaplain in his religious views.' When these expressions were published, Mr. Lowe requested an explanation, and was assured that they referred not to any vague reports, but only to the statements which he had himself heard him make from the pulpit. The reply is too good not to be laid before our readers:—

'Madeira, June 14, 1847.

'Dear Sir,—I am much obliged for the kind explanation you have sent me of your meaning in attributing to me 'peculiar views' at variance with your own; for you appear to have intended no reproach by this expression. At the same time, considering that such difference seems not only to have



influenced you in desiring to erase your signature from a paper to which you had affixed it, but to have possessed sufficient consequence to be brought forward publicly before the Earl of Aberdeen in his official capacity, in justification of requesting the withdrawal of your signature, I am afraid that any third person will still expect some more complete explanation of the real state or merits of the case than you have afforded, or had it in your power to afford.

‘I would not be supposed to seek to draw the bonds of agreement in matters of opinion closer than the Church has drawn them; but it is a question which may still, I fear, be thought not fully settled by your letter. Are not your expressions, coupled with actions so remarkable, calculated to convey to most minds an idea of peculiarity of views in points of doctrine beyond such allowed or authorized limits?’

‘It is therefore most satisfactory to have your declaration that ‘what you meant by my peculiar views is simply what you heard me preach;’ and, again, that ‘you only know my views by my preaching;’ for this enables me to satisfy yourself and all men, not only that such peculiarity is really, as your letter intimates, and so far as I am concerned, irrespective of all points of established faith or doctrine, but also that it exists, after all, rather on your side than on mine.

‘Before your letter reached me I feared you had been led into misapprehension by some false report or exaggeration, which it might have been as unpleasant to trace to its originators as difficult to refute. I am the more thankful, therefore, to find that the matter rests on ground so narrow, clear, and easy to approach.

‘Previous to your arrival, impressed by local circumstances strongly with the importance of avoiding all pretext for agitation or excitement in this place, I resolved for a season to have recourse to the works of some popular and well-known standard writer in our Church, of an age and stamp at once removed from all suspicion of connexion with the controversies of the present day, and of authority above cavil or impeachment. Such an author and divine was Bishop Beveridge, who had the further recommendation of being also a well-known powerful opponent of all Romanizing views and doctrines, and of being held in special favour by the extreme Puritan, or so-called Evangelical party, in our Church.

‘In proof of the reasonableness, or, indeed, the necessity, of my seeking some such safeguard against ignorance and prejudice, you will doubtless smile to hear that I was gravely charged, the very winter you were in Madeira, by a clergyman considered to be of that party, with preaching, in two sermons<sup>1</sup>

\*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*

those two very sermons being actually Bishop Beveridge’s!

‘I cannot, therefore, but rejoice again to claim the shelter of a name so venerable, for any supposed peculiarity of views attributed to me more generally by yourself. For it is certain that for every one of the sermons preached by me during your stay in Madeira, and on which your charge against me rests, Bishop Beveridge is entirely responsible. All the sermons which you heard me preach were not mine, but his. What you dissented from were *his* views, *his* words, and not peculiarly mine.

‘Instead, therefore, of fixing upon me any personal peculiarity of views, your allegation resolves itself into a statement of a difference of views between yourself and Bishop Beveridge, upon which I need not enter; for

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Lowe has omitted a passage here, as it was taken from a private letter of this clergyman; but, as the story is current in Madeira, we may as well state that the charge was, that the two sermons contained ‘views’ different from those of the venerable Beveridge.—*Lord Campden*, p. 24.

I heartily respond to your apparent inclination to avoid all unnecessary extension of this correspondence.

'I remain therefore,

'Dear Sir, yours very truly,

'(Signed)

R. T. LOWE.'

The Rev. T. Salwey.

It would seem that the course taken by the majority has as little support in the law of England as in the eternal principles of truth, and justice, and charity; the consul, indeed, and the secretary of state have hitherto supported their line against chaplain, bishop, and law. But common sense reclaims against these proceedings, and the law it seems speaks the same language:—

'A legal opinion was subsequently obtained as to the illegality of these resolutions, the opinion of an eminent counsel being that the meeting was constituted for the purpose of *carrying into execution* the objects of the Act regulating the affairs of British Churches abroad, and therefore not justified in withholding the chaplain's salary, such an act being in direct contravention of the law which provides for—1. The proper support of the chaplain—2. The due and proper maintenance of Divine Service—3. The expenses of the burial-ground—4. The interment of British subjects. Now, if the meeting have power to render null one portion of the Act, they have power to render null any other portion,—for instance, to forbid the interment of British subjects—which is manifestly absurd. The meeting have therefore no right to act as they do, in opposition to the Act of Parliament; and Lords Aberdeen and Palmerston are open to the charge of acting illegally in sanctioning the resolutions of the meeting.'—*Lord Campden*, p. 13.

The question seems exactly similar to that lately decided in England, by which it was settled that vestries cannot refuse to make necessary rates for the repair of the parish church; the vestry being a body legally constituted to carry the law into effect, not to defeat its provisions. So clearly does this case come under the principle of that decision, that the meeting itself could not exist if there was no chaplain. It is only in ports and places where there is a chaplain supported, &c., that the Act can be put in force at all. It would seem then that if the minority had not continued to contribute to the support of Mr. Lowe, the majority would have lost their right to meet and vote under the Act. But if Mr. Lowe is still chaplain, and is supported, as we have seen, by voluntary subscriptions, then there is no pretence for the wrong which the Foreign Office has committed in refusing the usual assistance towards his maintenance.

Still more evidently illegal was the other decision of the consul and the secretary of state, that the treasurer was justified in refusing subscriptions offered for the support of the chaplain, because the meeting had decided against allowing him any salary. Our readers will find in page 15 of Lord Campden's pamphlet, that eminent legal opinions have been given upon this point. But indeed no opinion was needed: for when the Act expressly

allows subscriptions for the purposes mentioned, or any of them, nothing but the extreme of prejudice could lead to the opinion that the treasurer could refuse to receive them for one of these purposes, because it chanced to be distasteful to the majority of the last 'general meeting.'

To hasten over this part of the subject, if the majority of a meeting be allowed to act as the Madeira meeting has hitherto acted, it is no longer true that the chaplain holds his office during her Majesty's pleasure. The majority of a general meeting may prevent his receiving the allowance given by her Majesty herself, even although the whole body of the communicants and of the congregation highly prize his services, and although nine-tenths of the subscribers are of the same opinion. A very small proportion only of the subscribers can have votes in the general meeting, and none of the poorer classes, so that the bounty of the Crown, the wishes of the congregation, and the intention of the subscribers, may alike be frustrated by the perverseness of two or three subscribers who may be members of the general meeting, on a mere money qualification, without being members of the English Church at all. It is vain to say that no spiritual authority is entrusted to this general meeting, if its members are allowed, as in the present instance, on grounds purely spiritual, not only to withhold from the chaplain their own subscriptions, but to prevent his receiving the allowance given by the Crown, and thus, perhaps, (in many instances, if not in this,) to enforce his resignation.

We have shown, we think, that the Act of Parliament itself is radically unjust and indefensible, because it entrusts the management of Church affairs to a body, all of whom may be, and many actually are, aliens from the Church; and because it fails to secure to the foreign chaplains that independence which it is the character of our Church to give to every incumbent, and in a great degree to every curate. It leaves them removable by the Crown, although still holding the unrevoked licence of the diocesan. This is so contrary to all Church principles as to be incapable of defence even for a moment; and thus far the law clearly needs amendment. Next, we have seen, that as it has been actually administered by the Foreign Office, it has been stretched against its evident meaning, so as to give to a tyrant majority power, even in matters spiritual, over chaplain, bishop, and Crown itself, even though that majority be altogether composed of Dissenters. It seems to follow, clearly, that some alteration of the law is immediately necessary, which shall prevent any persons, not *bonâ fide* Churchmen, from interfering with the affairs of the Church; shall secure to the chaplains, once appointed, the independence

of their office by making them irremovable except by the revocation of their licence,<sup>1</sup> and which shall declare for all future time the illegality of any vote on the part of the general meeting, by which the salary of the chaplain shall be stopped, or the offerings of any Churchman for his support refused. Let it be observed, we allow every one free liberty to subscribe or not as he pleases, we only refuse him (what we are sure the existing laws already refuse) the power of subscribing to the fund raised for the support of the chaplain, in order that he may be qualified to divert from his support both his own subscription and that of others.

But Churchmen in England must be alert in defence of their brethren in Madeira; 'If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it;'—the independence of the Church at home is compromised, if outrages such as those which it has been our duty to detail, are permitted to pass unchecked abroad. It is to the Church at home that the Churchmen of Madeira are looking for sympathy, nay, for common justice. From the Foreign Office, they have but too clearly learned, they must expect neither one or the other. This may be clear to our readers from the facts we have already stated, but we have not yet mentioned the worst and meanest. Mr. Lowe's salary for the year 1845 was voted by the general meeting, and paid by the treasurer; yet (if we are not misinformed) the half due to him from the Treasury for that year has been stopped, as well as for those years in which the meeting has refused their contribution. If this is, as we fear, correct, it is indeed deeply disgraceful to the administration of the Foreign Office.

But the Churchmen of Madeira will not call in vain upon their brethren at home. If they are unrepresented in the British Parliament, we are not, and we cannot for shame leave the government of England to perpetrate wrongs like these. If, any where in the wide circle of the globe, there be a portion of the Anglican Church which justly claims our sympathy and regard,

---

<sup>1</sup> This cannot be any infringement of those rights of the Crown of which the modern Whigs are so laudably jealous; for at this moment every holder of a Crown living, of a bishopric or a deanery, is in the same predicament; appointed by the Crown, but holding his office, not during pleasure, but during good behaviour. It was the boast of the reign of George III. that the judges were then put upon this footing; let the rendering the same justice to the foreign Chaplains be an ornament of the reign of his grand-daughter. Eminently does justice demand this when the Foreign Secretary may be, nay, so lately has been, a member of a hostile sect, and when, for all we know, he may soon be a Jew. It is plainly monstrous, that clergymen holding the licence of the Bishop, should be removable by such an authority. Meanwhile, if the Foreign Office makes a point of retaining the power of stopping at any time the government allowance, let it be so; we will not contend about money, but let not the spiritual office—the pastoral relation—depend on the will of secular authorities who may often not even be Churchmen.

that portion is the English factory of Madeira. Look to either of its constituent parts, the residents and the visitors, and say where shall we find men more worthy of our highest consideration.

Among the residents who have stood firm to the Church and their pastor are found the names of all the principal British merchants of Funchal, whose integrity, whose honour, whose hospitality, have for so many years adorned the English name. There are among those who have remained faithful,—we speak from personal knowledge, and an intimate acquaintance with their way of life during a protracted stay in England,—men whom it is a credit to the English Church to have brought up and to have retained under such auspices as those which preceded Mr. Lowe's appointment; whose dignified and serene consistency in practical works, whose conduct of their families, whose deep and regular appreciation of the means of grace, whose acquaintance with the principles of our Church, and whose whole life and conversation place them on the same standard with the very choicest of the English laity? Shall they be given up, bound, as we may say, hand and foot, into the power of the unhappy clique of all denominations which has accidentally obtained a majority in the parliamentary general meeting?—forbid it, justice—forbid it, shame. These men are they who built the English Church at Madeira, before the Act of Parliament, which is now used for their oppression, had been framed—before any allowance had been made by government, they supported the incumbent of that Church so liberally that his income (as Lord Campden observes) was larger when they supplied the whole than it has been since the Treasury has contributed half. Repeal the act, if you will—take away the aid of government if you think it can be done decently; but free the British merchants of Madeira from the odious tyranny which, under cover of that act, is now imposed upon them. Let them and their children enjoy the ministrations of that Church which they have founded and maintained, and which they so highly value.

Surely it were preposterous to suppose that even a temporary and ignominious peace could be purchased by the sacrifice of Mr. Lowe to his assailants. Should the Foreign Office be so ill advised as to throw itself openly into the arms of that faction, it has, indeed, power, under the present uneccelesiastical law, to deprive Mr. Lowe of his post, in open insult to the authority of the Bishop of London, and through him of the Church. But does the government of England really know so very little of the temper of Englishmen as to dream that the merchants of Funchal will submit to an outrage like this? They will know well, that on their side is right and justice, and the authority of the Church; on the other, a mob of all sects, and the parliamentary tyranny

of the Foreign Office. It may be that Lord Palmerston has legal power to put the nominee of the Roman Catholics, and Presbyterians, and Socinians, and No-religionists of Funchal into legal possession of the walls built by the Churchmen of Madeira for the place where they and their children might worship God. But does he dream that he can transfer the souls of men by such a proceeding? Let him observe what its religious and ecclesiastical effect will be. The Bishop will be bound more than ever to maintain the rights of the Church by continuing the licence of Mr. Lowe, and refusing to license Mr. Brown. The congregation, which has stood faithful to its pastor, will still be the assembly of the English Church in Madeira, under whatever roof it may assemble. The supporters of Mr. Brown will be the Church of the Foreign Office—the Church of Viscount Palmerston. Often, in the early ages, did the Church witness such scenes, but can it be the desire of a British Government to renew them? and can Lord Palmerston think, that, if he dares to put the insult upon the principal merchants of Madeira who are found on the side of the Church, they will be so dastardly as to give up their rights, their pastor, their Church, and their consciences, in submission to his decree? No, they have stood firm hitherto, and they will stand firm still; and, if scandal and schism ensue, they who, by abuse of human laws, eject a faithful pastor, whose authority the Church refuses to terminate, must alone bear the responsibility; and should this evil day arrive (which we will not anticipate), does Lord Palmerston doubt that the Churchmen of England will be able and willing to aid their brethren, the Churchmen of Madeira, in maintaining their pastor, even without the aid of the Treasury?

And what shall we say of the visitors? The Foreign Office, it seems, considers that they have no right to interfere in the question; it goes for nothing that the Act of Parliament recognises their right; this goes for nothing when the powers given by Parliament are used for the Church and not to her injury. But let us hear one of themselves.

‘It is scarcely necessary to tell you,’ (writes Mr. Bewicke) ‘that all members of the Church of England have an equal interest in the pure and simple celebration of the services of the Church of England;’ and if there is any difference in the permanence of this interest, as far as regards the services performed in this place, it must be remembered, that the greater part of the fluctuating portion of our fellow-countrymen come here with declining health, possibly after a few short months to be laid amid the crowded graves of the English cemetery. There were many who anticipated this fate; for myself, it is by the mercy of God alone I have been preserved. Can any persons have a more permanent interest in sacred things than those who are now standing on the verge of the grave? Can any need more the holy comforts of our religion than those who sit by the



tombs which have newly closed upon the dearest objects of their earthly affections?—P. 8.

Yes indeed, no pecuniary interest can be compared to that of a devout Churchman, who, after having lived perhaps years of engrossing secular occupation in England, and being now by the hand of Providence laid aside from worldly business either for life or even for some months, resorts to Madeira, not of choice but necessity, and finds that to Mr. Lowe,<sup>1</sup> under God, and to those who have supported him in this struggle, he owes it, that he may receive the Bread of life weekly instead of four times in the year or less—that he may daily and twice in the day join with a congregation of his brethren in the prayers of the Church, instead of once in seven days hearing part of them read by the chaplain and responded to by a single clerk.<sup>2</sup>

And interests like these, which run on into eternity, which have already been experienced at the death-beds of many scores in the fourteen years of Mr. Lowe's ministration, and have made their sojourn in Madeira a time of spiritual refreshment to as many more probably, who would else have found it a dry and sandy desert; these interests are so contemptible in the eyes of the Foreign Secretary, that he thinks it absolutely unbecoming for those who feel them to put their votes in competition with those of Roman Catholics, or Presbyterians, or Socinians, or men who frequent no worship at all save that of Mammon, because these, forsooth, 'are permanent residents!' Is it, then, certain and unquestionable that money is so much more precious than souls, —time so much more permanent than eternity?

We have no doubt that the subject of these visitors is a sore one to the persecutors of the Churchmen at Madeira, and of their faithful chaplain. Not that they are unwilling to make them pay for the support of the Church; as we have already seen, that they do not find objectionable; but there they would have them stop: therefore they exclude them by hiring pews and keeping them locked (can this be legal?) and would prevent their seeing and repeating in England the course of events. For men that would do deeds of darkness in a corner, it is hard that every year should bring earnest, devout, and liberal Churchmen, many of them sick, and feeling doubly the blessings which the Church offers them, to see and report their evil deeds. Such a visitor as Lord Campden indeed might be welcome enough, but that his report of their deeds in the pamphlet before us is galling in pro-

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bewicke also shows, that even in a pecuniary point of view the visitors deserve attention; as the residents have fixed the rate of pew rents so much higher for a visitor than for a resident, that in 1844, 238 seats occupied by permanent residents paid 476 dollars, while 159 seats occupied by temporary residents paid 736.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Bewicke, p. 3, mentions that this was the case at Madeira.

portion to the weight of his character and station. It is impossible not to remember, in writing these lines, the august Lady who is now seeking health in Madeira. May her visit there be a blessing, as has been the case wherever she has sojourned, to herself and those among whom she is dwelling! We doubt not that it will be so; that the Churchmen of Madeira will have cause to remember her visit with gratitude, and that the reports of visitors will no longer be treated with contempt, even by the Foreign Office, when the Queen Dowager of England has been numbered among them.

---

- ART. VI.—1. *The University Censure on Dr. Hampden.* London: Fellowes. 1847.
2. *The Third Hampden Agitation.* London: Fellowes. 1847.
3. *A Letter to Lord John Russell, &c. on the bearing which the Proposed Admission of Jews to Parliament, the Nomination of Dr. Hampden, &c., have on the Revival of Convocation, &c.* By the Rev. W. J. TROWER. London: Rivingtons. 1847.
4. *Are not the Clergy arraying themselves against Church and Queen? A Question.* By M. A. London: Ridgway. 1847.
5. *Letter by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, on the attempt to defeat the Nomination of Dr. Hampden.* London: Pickering. 1847.
6. *A Few Words on the Hampden Controversy.* By the HON. AND REV. ORLANDO FORESTER, M.A. London: Seeleys. 1847.
7. *A Reply to Lord John Russell's Letter to the Remonstrance of the Bishops, against the Appointment of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford.* By the RIGHT REV. HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER. London: Murray. 1847.
8. *Remarks on the Protest of the Bishops against Dr. Hampden's Appointment and Lord John Russell's Reply.* London: Straker. 1847.
9. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, &c.* By the REV. R. D. HAMPDEN, D.D., &c. London: Fellowes. 1847.
10. *A Churchman's Notes on Lord John Russell's Reply to the Bishops.* London: Rivingtons. 1847.
11. *The Royalty of the Crown in Episcopal Promotions, according to the judgment of Divines, Canonists, and others, of the Church of England.* London: Rivingtons. 1848.
12. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, on the Nomination of Dr. Hampden.* By AN ENGLISHMAN. London: Cleaver. 1847.
13. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, in reply to his Lordship's Answer to the Remonstrant Bishops; with a Postscript on Dr. Hampden's Letter.* By the REV. W. B. FLOWER, B.A., &c. &c. London: Masters. 1847.
14. *An Address to the People of England on the Present Mode of Appointing Bishops.* London: Masters. 1847.
15. *Dr. Hampden's Theology other than the Catholic Faith; A Letter to the Archdeacon of Wilts, &c.* By MAYOW W. MAYOW, M.A., Vicar of Market Lavington. London: T. B. Sharpe. 1847.
16. *Religious Liberty, and the Church in Chains, &c. &c.* By JAMES B. SWEET, Perpetual Curate of Woodville. London: Cleaver. 1847.

17. *Church Emancipation and Church Reform; in a Series of Letters.* By ECCLESIASTES. London; Hatchard. 1847.
18. *Convoocation: What is it? A Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, in Reply to his Lordship's Perversions of the Hampden Case.* By a CHURCHMAN. London: Longmans. 1847.
19. *A Letter to the Very Rev. the Dean of Chichester, on the agitation excited by the Appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford.* By JULIUS C. HARE, M.A., Archdeacon of Lewes. London: J. W. Parker. 1847.

It has been our lot, under the character in which we are now speaking, in many instances, to vindicate or to explain certain subjects connected with the University of Oxford. What a surge and rush of subjects presents itself in this connexion: the Six Doctors—the Vice-chancellorship—the last Oxford Election—No. 90—the Ward business—the Macmullen case—the new Theological Statute—the defeated Test,—all these, topics of the day, began, and, in the main, seemed to end in Oxford. The older question of the admission of Dissenters took, in some respects, a wider range; but still Oxford has seemed to the world a sort of volcano of its own. It has smoked or flashed on its own account: igneous elements were connected with it, which perhaps were underlying the whole empire; but the actual *Campi Phlegrevi* were of no great extent. Oxford is in eruption: lava has been heard of in Broad-street. This was all: it is only Oxford again. It is its way: it will begin and end in Oxford. The world's *ame damnée*—the plague-spot on the fair body of progress—the impracticable rock stretching out just where the liberal plough was going so nicely and fairly,—all these Oxford is, as a matter of course, to the politician of such days as our own: but the consolation was that it was only Oxford—a nest of bigots, it was true, but nothing more: a disagreeable and impracticable fact, but still only a fact—a single fact—a strong fact in itself, perhaps, but standing very isolated: a Gibraltar, it must be admitted, just insolently wrested from a large and showy kingdom; an obstinate mile of rough mountain bristling with ugly defences: but this was all. Its feuds were intestine and domestic. It attracted few sympathies except from Oxford men. It did not tell entirely even upon the Church: its complaints or triumphs awakened but broken echoes, except from the vanquished or victors of its own somewhat contracted battle-field. Its factions and seditions told as little on society at large as those of Coreyra upon Rome or Carthage. And yet it has been a curious phenomenon the way in which such a place as Oxford, separate and solitary, does occasionally affect the world's history. The last really great event in the history of this country is more than

closely connected with Oxford. If King James had not been unhappily advised to attack the liberties of the Church in the case of Magdalene College, the Revolution had probably not been; at any rate it had not taken its actual course. So that when Oxford matters, as a fact, do amount to something of more general importance than an academical struggle, it behoves all classes to watch a process which is not of every-day occurrence, or of light interest. When Oxford does shake the country, it does it thoroughly. It is not for nothing that it is, as now, in everybody's thoughts. At this moment the whole Church of Christ is feeling the vast importance of some tedious sermons preached to an unwilling audience fifteen years ago in the University pulpit.

Now, even to repeat the various proceedings of the last few years at Oxford makes quite a catalogue. They have already been chronicled in the pages of the 'Christian Remembrancer' (vol. ix. p. 519). Suffice it to say, that from the question of the admission of Dissenters in 1834, down to the attempted condemnation of No. 90 in 1845, a common element may be observed in them all. It is a remarkable fact, that all these academical struggles, differences, trials of strength, new statutes, new tests, new boards, decrees, condemnations, and the rest, seem to centre and cluster round one individual. Dr. Hampden is the common measure of Oxford strife: since Dr. Burton's death he is the logical presence of University rebuke and disunion—*ens unum in multis*,—the point around which every element of contest and controversy has successively ranged itself. The discussion on the admission of Dissenters received its chief acrimony from Dr. Hampden, whose pamphlet on the subject, 'Observations on Religious Dissent,' perhaps his most offensive publication, first necessitated system and order in the desultory and tumultuary strategics of the movement in Oxford. The same year, 1834—it is a remarkable coincidence—witnessed the completion of the first volume of the 'Tracts for the Times,' and this pamphlet on Dissent. From that day to this, for fourteen years, we have been witnessing only combinations of the same strain, nothing more than variations on a single theme: the one cardinal fact pervades every phase of the contest. Rationalism on the one side as a principle, and Dr. Hampden as its exponent. Dogmatism as a principle, and the whole movement party, as a body, including its various degrees and modifications, on the other. This is as it should be; but, waiving for the present the moral importance and significance of the fact, we would have it and its importance clearly brought out and seen. If history could be always thus simplified—if the one pervading, persisting, obstinate element in all great struggles were marked at each stage of contest, and at every evolution of contro-

versal tactics, if its reference to the original conception were pointed out, such would be the truest and most comprehensive historical philosophy.

In 1836 Dr. Hampden was censured by the Convocation. For some years nothing of great academical importance occurred. Dr. Godfrey Faussett, in 1838, was stirred up to deliver a sermon against Froude's Remains; but the interval between 1836 and 1841 was decidedly favourable to Catholic principles. From No. 1 to No. 90 the Tracts, with kindred writings, had won their steady way. Of course there was to be expected, and there was, a solid parallel growth of opposition, which, however, did not acquire sufficient body to make itself felt, till 1841, when its first achievement was to procure the Hebdomadal Board to express an opinion—miscalled, in some quarters, a judgment—on the Tract No. 90. Miscalled a judgment, we say, for the Hebdomadal Board possesses no legal function to express an academical judgment on any theological subject. But to connect this expression of opinion with Dr. Hampden—All boards and committees must have a leading mind; it is of the essence of these bodies to be swayed by individual power;—the active mind of the Hebdomadal Board, it is well known, was Dr. Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel, a pledged partizan of Dr. Hampden. The old *judicium* against Dr. Hampden, scarcely wrested from the reluctant consent of the heads, and resisted to the very last by Dr. Hawkins, now, and for the first time, had a chance of a reprisal. The tide had begun to turn against the Tracts; they had affronted too many cherished elements of self-indulgence and laxity to maintain, what they never sought, popularity; and, as soon as they were felt to be unpopular, an opportunity of retaliation presented itself. Drs. Faussett, Hawkins, and Hampden, had now a common cause, and they made the most of it. The author of Tract No. 90 had been forward, it was thought, in censuring Dr. Hampden; it was now his own turn to be censured;—and, in this way, it is easy to discover the connexion of the so-called censure of Mr. Newman with the Hampden case. It was only the common—may we add vulgar?—motive of turning the tables. Dr. Hampden had all along thought proper to make a personal matter of it—documents are in existence which will prove that the Regius Professor, by pointed allusions to the 'sacred profession' of one whom he chose to consider his enemy, was only withheld by such a consideration from adopting what, among laymen, would be deemed personal threats. The Hebdomadal Board was doubtless sufficiently hostile to the principles and theology of No. 90 itself; still its author was also considered in the light of a personal foe; and the champion and sponsor of Dr. Hampden,



Dr. Hawkins, was the leader of the opposition among the heads of houses to him.

To pass on to the proceedings of 1842. The month of May witnessed the promulgation and enactment of the new Theological Statute, constituting a theological board of examiners, with the Royal Reader in Divinity for its head. It was at first surmised, afterwards confessed, and has ever since been boasted, that the true motive for passing this complex statute was, indirectly, to rescind the University censure of 1836 on Dr. Hampden. The new board, and the new professors, pastoral and exegetical, candidates and licentiates, students and examinations, lectures and canonries, were only the cloud of mist through which to smuggle back Dr. Hampden to his honours. The Hebdomadal Board performed a piece of cumbrous diligence, which did not so much aim at the improvement of the theological faculty, as rather sought on the sly to whitewash the concrete Dr. Hampden, under colour of legislating about an abstract Regius Professor of Divinity. That it would have been the right and consistent course to have rejected the whole scheme at once and totally, because indirectly it recognised Dr. Hampden, is more easy to observe now, and to regret, than it was to incur the odium and obloquy of such a course before the measure of the next month, June, revealed the latent object of the Theological Statute. The veil was, however, soon dropped; and the attempt of June 7 was the direct 'revival of the Hampden question,' by a proposal to repeal the No-confidence Statute of 1836. The fate of this measure is well known; but we are not writing the history of the last academic decade of years, we are only pointing out the constant presence and recurrence of the insatiable Ate of Oxford, in the person of Dr. Hampden:—

ἡ μέγαν οἴκοις τοῖσδε  
δαίμονα καὶ βαρύνειν αἰνεῖς,  
φεῦ, φεῦ, κακὸν αἶνον ἀτη-  
ρὰς τύχας ἀκορέστων.

The year 1843 was only distinguished by the private piece of injustice and cruelty executed by Dr. Wynter and the Six Doctors on Dr. Pusey: a piece of oppression from which the statute passed against Dr. Hampden, fortunately relieved him from a direct share. The fulness and vigour, however, of the Hampden influence in 1844, more than made up for its scanty, or perhaps concealed, exercise in the preceding year. The Oxford annals of 1844 were made up of the tedious Macmullen case, ranging, indeed, in all its details over two previous years, for its commencement synchronized with the attempt to revoke the Hampden

censure in 1842. The whole University was now thrown into strife and heart-burning, through Dr. Hampden's attempt to convert an unstatutable practice adopted by his predecessor with reference to the B.D. degree, into a private test to be wielded according to the theological sympathies of the uncontrolled Regius Professor of Divinity. That this attempt did not succeed, was not the fault of the Hebdomadal Board; for it was the convocation of May, 1844, which, by a majority of 341 to 21, rejected the celebrated measure, which was only putting Dr. Hampden's test into the shape of a working statute.

In 1845, the same tactics were tried in connexion with the memorable Ward case. Adroitly availing themselves of the discredit which this person's publications had entailed upon the whole Catholic movement, the Hebdomadal Board, and Dr. Hampden, once more tried their favourite piece of tyranny at concocting a test, in the form of a declaration respecting the sense of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. This test, it is well known, and it has been stated already in these pages ('Christian Remembrancer,' vol. ix. p. 535), was carried through the Hebdomadal Board by the instrumentality of Dr. Hawkins with the concurrence of Dr. Hampden, aided by a letter from Archbishop Whately. That it never survived its rickety birth so as to be submitted to convocation—or that its substitute, the measure against No. 90, was vetoed by the Proctors—only proves the weakness of the cause itself, viz. to tie up subscription to the Articles, not the animus of the party who wished to enforce it. The very same person who in 1834 described the Articles as the remnant of a 'Scholastic Philosophy'—the last fragment of a debasing and bigoted dogmatism—the very same person, the liberal, the champion for free exposition, now came forward as the maintainer of the very opposite view. And why? Only for the sake of grasping a convenient weapon to wield upon inconvenient opponents. This was the last great occasion in which a great Faction Fight occurred at Oxford.

Here then, in every one of these perplexing cases, through the struggles and the anxieties of these ten weary years—one perpetual presence haunts the academic scene. Analyze every feud, and Dr. Hampden is the residuum. Is there an especial piece of illegal spite, such as the twice-attempted Test? it is to lodge authority in hands which will be far from loath to use it, those of Dr. Hampden. Is there one protracted attempt of power to crush an individual? Dr. Hampden is staunch in pursuit of his foe. Is there a favourable moment when the popular howl is up? Dr. Hampden is quick in seizing the right moment to catch his ancient enemy at a helpless disadvantage. Dr. Hampden retains a vivid recollection of what he is pleased

to call his injuries in 1836: he has neither disavowed nor concealed his desire to retaliate upon his condemners. To censure Dr. Pusey, because Dr. Hampden was censured—to invoke against Mr. Ward a privilege from a ‘tumultuous majority,’ such as that which was arrayed against Dr. Hampden—this, and the parallel has been, and might be further pursued, was quoted by Dr. Hampden’s friends as a visible interposition of a just and inflexible Nemesis. But Nemesis has a subjective as well as an objective application: and to attribute to vengeance what is due to revenge is a sophism not very hazardous to venture on.

Antecedently, then—before entering into the merits of any dispute—Dr. Hampden’s presence and position in Oxford has had the effect of making it a scene of successive conflicts. He has, if not fomented, at least been the voluntary or other cause of strife: where he has not come forward prominently, his indirect influence has agitated the University. He has had the wit to use the Hebdomadal Board all along to fight *his* battles—to vindicate *his* reputation—to reappropriate *his* deprived functions—to sow dissension among *his* oppressors, while they thought they were doing all sorts of things, devising tests, judging sermons or tracts, vindicating the authority of ‘the resident Governor,’ and the like. To those who, either as residents in Oxford, or as more closely connected with it, have not been without opportunities of watching the less prominent motives, and the secret springs connected with its later history, we owe some apology for dwelling upon what has been long familiar to them: but there are others to whom what we have said may be of service, partly to recall, and partly to group together, the various events with which Dr. Hampden’s name occasionally, and his presence perpetually, both in the University and beyond it, has been associated. Dr. Hampden has given us one history of what he is pleased to call, ‘his manner of life and conversation now for twelve years past.’ We have done nothing more than suggest a few memoranda to complete the biography. For to write the history of the more recent Oxford politics, is to write the rise and progress of Hampdenism: the two subjects are commensurate.

And the present emergency calls rather for this general grouping together of events, the connexion of which is not on the surface. In 1836 we found ourselves protesting with the University of Oxford against this person’s appointment as its Regius Professor of Divinity. The year 1847 is closing with a far more memorable and significant protest on the part—not of one of the Universities—but of a very considerable portion of the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England against an

attempt to make Dr. Hampden a Bishop. Dr. Hampden's first appointment, at the worst, was but an off-hand piece of eccentricity on the part of a cringing minister: now there is something very like a direct old-fashioned mediæval fight between Church and State. It is the Regale and Pontificale matched. It is the old story of Investitures again. The ancient battle-cry seems to ring up from the days of feudalism: and the 'Liberties of the Church' stands a chance once more of having other than an historical interest for ourselves. It is no longer an ordinary chapter in Oxford polemics. Contrasting the present with all the other incidents to which we have alluded, there is a very significant difference. Oxford—most interested—preserves a dignified and becoming silence. It is felt that the present is not a case for common-room meetings; for the routine of declarations and protests; of circulars and chairmen of committees. The University question is merged in that of the Church. Even the sharp arrowy sleet of pamphlets drives from other quarters than the Turle. For the very first time in our own experience, we have a public question—not interesting, but vital to Oxford—involving the feelings paramount in that place for twelve years, which in a fortnight produces a storm of letters, documents, pamphlets, and every variety of polemical missile, not one of which bears an Oxford imprint. This is as creditable to the grave dignity as it is to the forbearance of the residents. Such silence proclaims that the question is neither local nor academical; still less, personal. It is too serious for ordinary treatment.

Why should Lord John Russell select Dr. Hampden? is the question in everybody's mouth. To which in our judgment the fairest answer is the equally pertinent one: Why should he not? Oh! but his Churchmanship! his speech at the Mansion-house; his attendance—how often is not said—at his parish Church. This speech at the Mansion-house—we heard it—certainly amounted to enunciating the duty of a State to attend to the religion of its subjects. This was his practical view, founded upon the moral axiom, more recently stated,<sup>1</sup> that 'politics are not to be severed from religion.' A magnificent structure of expectations was built by well-meaning persons on this somewhat slender foundation. The fact is, that as far as he is a Churchman at all, Lord John is a disciple of Dr. Arnold. Dr. Arnold's speculations are equally of the character which suits a statesman, especially of the liberal school. Dr. Arnold argues the identity of Church and State; but the State comes first, not only practically but theoretically; the ideal Church is but a reflex of the ideal

<sup>1</sup> Debate on introducing the Jewish Disabilities Relief Bill.

State. But the State is prior in conception; the Church only a phase or manifestation of it. If we may so state it, Dr. Arnold takes a sort of Sabellian view of the Church as a mere character of the greater and higher State reality. The Church is the State working for a specific purpose and in a single direction. Of course such a theory will just suit a politician. Given the State as a fact—take it as you find it—follows the Church commensurate with it. If the State happens to consist of ‘various denominations,’ the Arnoldian Church is pliable and elastic and embraces them all, *vi terminorum*. What powers the State has the Church has, of the same sort and character, because in point of fact they are the same powers. So everything ‘transcendental,’ as has been said,—everything which brings in the notion of spiritual powers, Apostolical descent, mystery, inherent grace, of a Kingdom of Heaven, at once vanishes from this very simple conception of the Church. It is quite compatible with this view to hold a very strong tyrannical element of government. Dr. Arnold himself was not afraid of this consequence; for as he happened to think that Jews were not members of his ideal commonwealth, not citizens, he would not have recoiled with very serious alarm from applying to them as aliens at least a ‘modified theory of persecution.’ How far his feeling that ‘had we brought the Jews here as captives, I should think that we ought to take them back again, and ‘I should think myself bound to subscribe for that purpose,’ would be inconsistent with a serious proposition to banish them, we doubt. This forcible deportation of some thousands of people, even with the salvo of a subscription list, has a good hearty twang of persecution about it. There is vigour and the strong arm of government, and very little practical liberalism in its enunciation. So that this combination of comprehension and liberality in theory, with a stout tyranny in practice, is suited for a statesman’s comprehension. It fits in both with what he has to say and what he has to do. It is no wonder, then, that Dr. Arnold’s *Life and Correspondence* is appealed to as a sort of text book for statesmen in religious matters.

If, then, Lord John Russell has seriously adopted Dr. Arnold’s theory—and it seems to us that this alone reconciles certain paradoxes in his late career—and if that fair and serious aspect of sincerity, which all parties seem to recognise both in the teacher and his disciples, and which accounts entirely for a certain manifestation of a certain sort of Churchmanship in the present Premier, is, when resolved, nothing more than Arnoldism, we should say, that Dr. Hampden is the very man whom a true Arnoldian would select as the best exponent of such views. To be sure there is a marked difference between Dr. Arnold

and Dr. Hampden as men. Dr. Arnold, it seems, was so amiable and winning, that many are almost disposed to forget his most grave errors and heresy as a theologian in personal attachment to the man. Churchmen have coquetted overmuch with Dr. Arnold and his school. His friends and disciples have powers—kindness—character and acquirements: but it is high time to remind people what lies on the other side—a principle, as is shown elsewhere in the present number of this Review, utterly destructive of the very being of the Church. Now Dr. Arnold's was a magnetic mind; of Dr. Hampden's personal friends, it so happens that we never heard. Of course it may be accounted for without charging him with moroseness or sullenness. But whatever the ethical difference in character between Dr. Arnold and Dr. Hampden, it is well known that Dr. Arnold committed himself to Dr. Hampden. Nay, he did more: he committed himself—and that most grievously—for Dr. Hampden. The article upon the 'Oxford malignants,' betraying such passions as must ever prevent Dr. Arnold maintaining a claim to heroic goodness—an article which, if written by any other person, would be sufficient proof of very low morality even in the author—was Dr. Arnold's deliberate testimony to the justice of Dr. Hampden's cause. 'Hampden'—we fear that this particular testimony to the character of his labours, will be thought by those most interested, scarcely consistent with the character of the representative of pure Reformation principles which he now claims—'Hampden is doing what real Christian reformers have ever done; what the Protestants did with Catholicism, and the Apostles with Judaism.' This is Dr. Arnold's judgment of Dr. Hampden's qualifications as a reformer and developer of 'Protestantism,' because 'the time is come when the phraseology of the articles requires to be protested against,' and he openly throws out (vol. ii. p. 39) the hypothesis, 'if Hampden is to be made a Bishop,' &c. Now Lord Melbourne promoted Dr. Arnold to his professorship, and would, it is said, have given him a Bishopric, had not an intimation, the same in character, and from the same ecclesiastical authority, been presented to the Premier of 1837, which the Premier of 1847 affects to ignore. But it was—so it is rumoured—a matter of direct complaint to Lord Melbourne from Lord John Russell, that the first Whig government had not made Dr. Hampden a Bishop. Lord John's line is a certain fool-hardiness which passes for chivalry; and if we bear in mind both Dr. Hampden's connexion with Dr. Arnold,—the open way in which his cause has been defended by M. Bunsen and the Archbishop of Dublin—the interest which the former exercises at Court, and the claims for old Whig services even upon an English Metro-



politan throne, which the latter would willingly forego for the sake of the promotion of such an ally as Dr. Hampden—together with the Premier's willingness to do a bold thing, as a proof of a strong government, not perhaps without the wish to escape even from that growing, but inconvenient, reputation for Churchmanship, which might prove troublesome in a parliament composed as the new one is—in all these things, we see quite enough to account for the selection of Dr. Hampden for the See of Hereford.

To account for it, but hardly in a political view to justify it. *We* have the gravest faults to charge against the selection; but simply as a political error it is culpable. It will bear canvassing as ill in the windows of the Reform Club as in an Oxford Common-room. A statesman is bound to take into consideration the state of the public mind; if ignorant of it, his first duty is to acquire information on it. Facts abundantly prove either an ignorance which is in itself inexcusable, or a woful miscalculation. Even the liberal press rather defends than applauds. The Whigs begin to feel that Dr. Hampden was hardly worth his powder. If Lord John ever achieves historical fame, it will be as a politician; but so serious a political blunder, one akin to that which turned Sacheverell into a questionable sort of confessor, will prevent his taking high rank as a statesman. Simple fanaticism could be his only apology; but then the Premier has never shown sufficient of an ebullient zeal for any religious profession to adopt this—perhaps his most decorous—excuse.

There is only one view of Lord John Russell's policy, which perhaps is consistent and tenable; and though it is the most obvious, and perhaps the true one, we are somewhat loath to mention it. It may be described perhaps, as a deliberate and calculated design to bring the Church down—to prove to all the world that the Church of England is a mere creature of the State—to dispose of all her high pretensions, pretensions, too, which have neither slept nor been curtailed during the last dozen years, by an intelligible act of despotism and tyranny—to show all her enemies on the right hand and on the left, that her succession is a thing of State sufferance, her doctrine a piece of parliamentary permission, her spiritual authority but a repealable statute, her bishops and priests only a respectable kind of police. It certainly looks more like this than anything else. The Government had recently acquired odium in 'forcing a Bishop' on the reluctant heathenism of Manchester. 'No new Bishops,' was a sort of electioneering cry; Mr. Macaulay had lost the metropolis of John Knox's religion for voting for the increase of the Episcopate. Something must be done to show the 'dissenting interest' that 'Tractarian' influences had

not overawed Downing-street. We must prove by a bold course that we do not think Bishops any thing very transcendental; to promote another Elliott, or a Villiers, or a Russell, is only the old story; a Mercury may be made of any block. What is wanted now is to show, that in the Whig estimate, though we may consent to making new Bishops, we despise them: *fiat experimentum in corpore vili*. If Dr. Hampden is made a Bishop, we shall at least hear no more of our Hyper-Episcopalian tendencies.

Now, clever as all this is, we cannot quite see the use of it, or that, upon the same calculation of interests, it was worth while to take the step. But this is the minister's concern, not ours. We waive the discussion on this question. If it be said that Lord John was simply politic in his nomination, we think it a political blunder: the excuse of fanaticism will hardly avail, for it is rather too broad and bold an instalment of that particular vice for a beginner in the zealot's line: the discredit of a mere piece of wanton folly and sheer unreasoning arrogance, it is not decorous to urge against any English minister, not quite fair either in this particular case. The view that it is the result of a decided and combined attempt to engraft fairly the spirit and principles of Dr. Arnold, under the auspices, perhaps under the advice, of M. Bunsen and Dr. Whately, upon the Church of England, and thus in the See of Hereford actually to give us the first instalment of the Church of the Future, seems to ourselves the most rational account of an event which, under any other aspect, is as useless and improvident, in the way of insult, as it is short-sighted in policy, while malignant in intention.

To describe the effect of the announcement is superfluous. None of our readers require to be reminded—though they may not object to see it recorded—how deep and universal has been the feeling which this event has called out—how the first ‘withering fear and dumb amazement’ was succeeded by a burst of indignation so vast and unparalleled, that we care rather to describe it by facts than by an amplification of language. It was on Monday, 15th of November, that the ‘Times,’ informally of course, announced the appointment, and, though the steady supporter of Government, has denounced it in a series of articles as remarkable for power as for moderation. Immediately the clergy began to protest publicly and privately: they met by parishes, by rural deaneries, by archdeaconries; in every possible way, judiciously, and occasionally with precipitancy, they poured in a flood of remonstrance—to the Queen, to the Premier (a blunder in our judgment), to the Bishops, they appealed—to the former for redress, to the latter for protection. The Dean and Chapter of Hereford had some time ago, we are informed,

received upwards of 200 addresses of counsel and sympathy. And as early as the first week in December, thirteen Bishops, the most prudent, and estimable, and learned on the bench, testified, in a conjoint letter (the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ripon in separate communications,) to the 'apprehension and alarm which had been excited in the minds of the 'clergy by the rumoured nomination,' coupled with the very significant intimation—significant, that is, to all except one labouring under something akin to a divine hardening—that to persist in the appointment would be to involve 'the greatest danger both of the interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most desirable that the clergy and laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the Royal Supremacy, especially as regards that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to 'vacant Sees.' Whatever other character this important document has, its first and most obvious value is in the proof which it bears to the extent and amount of feeling on the question. Bishops—English Bishops—Bishops ranging in theological sympathies from Exeter to Winchester—Bishops of the peculiar caution and discretion so well known in Drs. Kaye and Turton, *ex. grat.*, are not over-likely to commit themselves to an unguarded statement of a mere matter of fact. The Episcopal remonstrance, then, is more than an adequate answer to the unparalleled mendacity which asserts either the poverty or the party character of the opposition.

But more than this—it were ungracious to accept the address of the thirteen, or rather fifteen, Bishops as a mere statement of a single fact countersigned and authenticated by the competent authority. It is a new thing for Bishops, themselves the creation of a compact or alliance, call it what we will, not of three hundred years' standing, but more or less coeval with Constantine's dotation, to announce that this most ancient arrangement or machinery of State nominations has become so 'delicate,' in its adjustment or working, that a single event will, in their judgment, disturb it—perhaps stop it. Why should the Bishops say this, unless there were a cause? Their interests were not endangered, the privileges of their order were not invaded in the sense of any temporal hazard or loss; Dr. Hampden's promotion disappointed no secular expectations among the remonstrant bishops. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London were hardly on the look-out for the See of Hereford. If the reclamation was only that of a 'Tractarian' clique, would the Bishop of Winchester—would the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol—have indorsed it? If it were the mere prolongation of an university dispute, why should the Bishops

of London, and Bangor, and Ely, and Lincoln, stand sponsors to a defunct, or partial, Oxford controversy? It must have been for more than to acknowledge the mere fact of the existing excitement among the clergy that the fifteen Bishops came forward. We claim boldly, on the part of the Church of England, its full weight for the episcopal protest, in that candid, open, patent construction which this act of more than the majority of its prelates, as a fact, bears as well in the eyes of foes as of friends. It was because the Catholic Faith is endangered, that the guardians of her faith were enabled—may we say? permitted and strengthened—to plead for it. Other influences than those of mere secular policy are at work, as we trust, both around us and in us. As it is not for nothing that we have been entrusted with a charge, so, though we may have much to regret in our negligent handling or hold of the terrible and tremendous deposit of the ‘faith once committed,’ we shall not be permitted to have it silently dropped, or plundered. The spirit which gave it can move the hearts of men ‘when It listeth.’ But we forbear these considerations, content only to call attention to what struck us as the feature which, whether we press it or not, has impressed many.

And this is the utter unexpectedness of such a protest in such a quarter. Antecedently, the most sanguine speculator could hardly have looked for it; and, just at this juncture, we may as well own it, there was a good deal to distress and harass earnest minds. It must have been so; we all know that it was so, or why the need, just now, of such works as Dr. Pusey’s last Preface, or Mr. Keble’s Preface to his recent Sermons? We care not to be explicit: but men began to be asking, we admit, in a faithless way, for signs; they were pleading for tokens; they complained of the faintness or uncertainty of our notes. Now, though ordinarily, this craving after signs is but a ‘tempting of the Lord,’ yet, it may be, ‘that the Lord Himself shall give you a sign.’ And though this fixing upon this or that event as *the* sign, may be dangerous, yet we ask for any more rational solution of the present events than this; viz. that we are in some very remarkable way going through a sifting course, which will *prove* what we are, and Whose we are. For the first time, a ‘Reformed’ and ‘Established,’ and in some sense ‘Protestant,’ Church, has found a voice in its Bishops to deprecate heterodoxy. For the first time, a Dean has been found openly to challenge the Prime Minister to inflict upon him the pains of ‘the most hateful and tyrannical law’ which disgraces our Statute Book rather than violate his conscience by electing one, against whom the collective testimony of the Church protests. Come what may of these proceedings, they constitute a

sign not to be spoken lightly of; and gratitude is even due to the unhappy instrument who has been—it may be—overruled to force from the Church of England that indignant appeal, in the face of all Christendom, which no failure in details can lessen or efface. Who, amidst past distresses and perplexities, could have anticipated such an evidence of energy and spiritual life? And that it was vouchsafed at such a juncture, in the midst of those Advent warnings—‘men’s hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth,’—in the very week when the solemn prayer was daily offered, that ‘He, who purchased to Himself an universal Church by the precious blood of His dear Son, would so guide and govern the minds of His servants, the bishops and pastors of His flock, that they may lay hands suddenly on no man,’ made the testimony doubly significant.

Lord John Russell’s reply to the communication of the Bishops is dated 8th December; and on the same day he thought proper to read a lecture on Christian charity, and his views of University law, to some hundreds of the laity, persons of the highest distinction in rank, literature, and the clerkly professions. We are not called upon to pause much upon these documents; though a word which would be wasted on their arguments may be spared on the temper which they display. And as our readers have doubtless, with keen satisfaction, seen the Bishop of Exeter’s masterly and true-hearted rebuke of the small sophistries of the Premier, as well as other publications on that side, we will present them, with a criticism from a quarter favourable to the writer, with which they are not very likely to have met. And while the testimony of the ‘Weekly Dispatch,’ in favour of Dr. Hampden, has another value, it has this importance in showing that Lord John’s letters present but one aspect to the common mind, that of being nothing more real or dignified than a sharp, snarling, little piece of retort. How far such a tone was worthy of the occasion or the writer we forbear to remark:—

‘His reply is a choice morsel of criticism. How cleverly he hits the cowardice of the Bishops in not avowing their own conviction of Dr. Hampden’s heresy, but falling back upon the alarms of others. How neatly he reminds them of their having (some of them at least) required candidates for Holy Orders to have attended the lectures of this obnoxious Professor. How cavalierly he sets aside the authority of the University of Oxford, like one who was mindful of its expulsion of John Locke. How quiet his allusion to the poor old Primate, whose repose at Lambeth is likely to be sorely disturbed. And what a significant hint is given of that supreme authority vested in her who inherits the throne of Elizabeth and of Henry VIII.; the living head of the Church and disposer of its dignities; the Lady Pope of Anglican Protestantism. The Episcopal knuckles are

smartly rapped by his Lordship; and the royal *congé d'élire* goes to Hereford as if nothing had happened.'—*Weekly Dispatch*, Dec. 19.<sup>1</sup>

Yes; Lord John's 'sarcastic logic,' and 'choice morsels of criticism,' his 'clever hits,' and 'neat reminders,' his 'quiet allusions,' and 'significant hints,' and 'smart raps,' and all his other playful polemics, had but just this little fault—they were too clever. The occasion was not one of squibbing and snip-snap. All along the Premier seems to have misunderstood and blundered about the moral value of the whole case. History tells of other such mistakes: James II. committed one, in underrating the occasion when he ordered the Declaration to be read, as though there were nothing out of the common way in it;—Charles X. did the same, when he allowed Prince Polignac to issue the Ordinances, and went hunting;—and so, doubtless, Lord John chuckled grimly, when he had sent the twin letters, and calmly turned over his blotting-book as if nothing had happened.

Lord John's reply to the Bishops, though dated 8th December, was not delivered till the night of Thursday, the 9th, and the correspondence was published in 'the Times' of Monday, the 13th. Meanwhile the Bishop of Exeter's letter was written, and in print on the evening of the same day, and was published in the 'Times' and 'Post' of Tuesday the 14th, so that the 'clever morsel of criticism,' like other clever morsels, did not linger long on the public palate: the delicate gusto of Downing street was expelled, next morning, by the stronger flavour of Exeter; and Lord John's claims to a distinguished place in the 'Complete Letter-Writer' were effaced by one whose letters unite the forcible style and condensed scornful criticism of a professed reviewer, with the weighty indignation and solemnity of a Christian prelate. The Bishop of Exeter's powers in this particular range of composition, uniting severity with dignity, and combining argument with contemptuous retort, are too well

<sup>1</sup> It would be unfair to Dr. Hampden not to allow him the weight of the sincere opinion formed of him by this writer; certainly not the least shrewd or talented of his friends. It is well to know, in addition to the testimonies to Dr. Hampden's merits, from 'several Prelates of our Church,' that he also enjoys the patronage and perusal of 'Publicola' of the 'Weekly Dispatch.' We add a passage which precedes the extract in the text:—

'Dr Hampden is a sound philosopher, but an unsound believer. He has more faith in the moral nature of man than in the three creeds. His writings are in a wise and lofty spirit; but they are not in the spirit of the Catechism and Prayer-book. It is vain to blink the fact, that the man is a heretic; and the heretic is too much of a true man to be fit for a Church-of-England Bishop, if we take the constitution of the Church itself for a standard. Here is the weak point of the appointment. The Church demands orthodoxy of all, and especially of its prelates. Technically, the reply is good, that Dr. Hampden has subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles. But what is it morally? Dr. Hampden would have been a greater man had he kicked the mitre with his foot instead of bowing his head to wear it. He might have risen to martyrdom; he only sinks into a bishopric.'



known for us to enlarge upon them. Lord John's cleverness had simply been effaced as by a chemical agent—it vanished without a trace—his wiliness had found something quite as subtle, and a little more permanent. Lord John had lived and was not—he was like the May-fly in Callcott's glee:—

‘Poor insect! what a little day  
Of sunny bliss is thine!  
And yet thou spread'st thy light wings gay,  
And bidd'st them spreading shine.  
‘Thou humm'st thy short and busy tune,  
Unmindful of the blast,  
And careless while 'tis burning noon,  
How short that noon has past!’

And now was the Premier's hour of grace. ‘Forbear, my lord, while you have yet time; persist not in your rash experiment —retrace your steps.’ The warning was solemnly uttered, and dutifully; but there are ominous sounds, even those rare ones of a bishop's warning, which devoted ears may not hear; the presage came from a quarter where the Premier had learned in bygone days to tremble; the warning was grave;

‘Nomenque erat auguris ingens;  
Spernit Echionides tamen hunc, ex omnibus unus  
Contemptor Superum, Pentheus; præsagaque ridet  
Verba senis;—

And on the 17th December, the Friday in Ember Week, the Congé d'Elire and Letters Missive, containing the fatal name of Hampden, were sent down to Hereford. On Monday, the 20th, the ‘Times’ published Dean Merewether's formal petition to the Queen, of the same date, the 17th, as the receipt of the Letters Missive, to be released from the election—a document, we venture to say, of which the actual value in invigorating English hearts is incalculable—a document which will possess historical weight and interest in days now far distant, as the petition of the Seven Bishops possesses in our own days; and for which the thanks of the whole Church are due to the writer. The receipt of the Dean's memorial was curtly acknowledged by Sir George Grey, with the notice that the Queen had ‘no commands.’ On the 27th instant appeared a document, if possible, of greater energy; Dean Merewether's memorable letter to Lord John Russell, reciting the whole deplorable case, announcing that every means had been tried to avert the blow, that a correspondence had passed, that interviews had taken place, in which Lord John had persisted in his determination ‘to let the law take its course,’ but concluding with the assurance, that in spite of what nearly amounted to ‘threats’ on the Premier's part, ‘no power on earth’ should induce him to consent to the election.

And on the 28th of December,—immediately after that significant second lesson which announced an Apostle's protestation from the authority of a cold-hearted political deputy, the Russell of his country—at last, when it was found that an appeal to the royal tribunal of justice had failed, the Lady Chapel of Hereford witnessed an appeal to a greater judgment-seat than that of Cæsar. A majority of the Capitular body went through the form of an election—the Dean and Canon Huntingford being dissentient. This was to have been expected. The Dean openly declared that the Statutes required the election to be unanimous;—which it was not; and that the Dean and three Residentiaries must be parties assenting; which they were not. Under this view, which we believe to be the legal one, the election being void, will be annulled at confirmation—the next stage in the proceedings. And, quitting here the historical part of our task, we may conclude it with the well-omened words with which the bishops left the court of James II.—‘The will of God be done.’

And we have arrived at something more than the crowning-point of this particular and single narrative—at something more important to the interests of this kingdom than this the fitting catastrophe of the ‘Hampden controversy.’ Even in that, the less prominent light, this great Hampden case has been, at last, fairly played through. It has had its beginning, middle, and end; it is a true and perfect drama. It has a technical and rigid unity. It is one, whole and perfect, and has unfolded itself legitimately. From the first, there was a largeness and solidity in the question. It began well, and it has ended well. A protest, and a successful one for the doctrinal purity of the English Church, outraged in one of its chief seats and fountains of learning, has ended in a protest, and an influential one, for its spiritual rights. Depth and consistency have marked every successive stage of the case. It was for the purity of the faith that the University censured Dr. Hampden as a teacher of the Church's faith—it is for the purity of the faith that the Church has rejected him as a guardian of the Church's faith. Nothing less than the very highest, and most hallowed, and vital interests of the Church—its soundness in ‘the Catholic faith’—being at issue, could have justified this protracted and painful struggle. For a less cause than this, such a triumph would not have been permitted. And comparing the present with the other historical grounds for rejecting an undue exercise of the Regale which may seem parallel to the present case, Dr. Hampden's spiritual incapacity for the Episcopate arises from a cause much more grave and serious. It is this fact which gives its critical and decisive character and mark to the case.

In the troubles of Archbishop Becket the principle contended for was the same, and the difficulties which the high-minded and uncalculating assertion of them had to contend with were the same. For, in 1163, as well as in 1847, could be found Bishops of England who contended, 'that the world must obey the world's laws; and that, by sacrificing the liberty of the Church, they in no way compromised the Church itself—indeed, to do so were rather to strengthen it; "for," said they, "an obstinate resistance can end in nothing but our own ruin, whereas, by giving way to the king on this point, we may retain our inheritance in God's sanctuary, and repose in the peaceable possession of our churches: for we are placed in difficult circumstances, and the temper of the times requires of us large concessions."' This was the language on one side; and it is equally true and thankworthy that the opposite language of the Archbishop might pass for one of Dean Merewether's true-hearted appeals, 'You disguise to yourselves your cowardice under the name of patience, and, on the pretext of concession, you would enslave the spouse of Christ. The cause of God is not so ill supported as to require the fall of man that it may stand. Nor is the Most High at a loss for means to uphold His Church, though unaided by the truckling policy of its [dignitaries].' What is asked by the State now was asked then, only 'to conform unreservedly to the usages of this kingdom,' which very request now, as then, is admitted, 'consistently with the privileges of the Church of Christ.' In the days of Becket indeed, this lofty language was used about the respective rights of the civil and ecclesiastical courts over criminous clerks: in our own times, peril to a sound confession of the truth of the cardinal doctrine of the Most Blessed Trinity itself has awakened it; but the language is in both cases the language of the Church opposing and protesting against the world and its powers.

So again in the days of S. Anselm. Far are we from undervaluing the principle which involved him in his life-long dispute about investitures. We admit to the full how deeply the liberties of the Church may be perilled, especially in a formal ceremonial stage of society, by what seems so very a trifle as this or that hand giving ring and pastoral staff. But in a practical, and as it is called, sensible age of the world, it is something to find, that if the Church and the world must be fairly pitted, when a fight *à l'outrance* is inevitable, that it should be about creeds rather than copes. The last have their value: and if it is once fairly made known and admitted on both sides, that the two parties have rested the whole question of Church rights and Church authority on so insignificant a subject as a surplice, and that this, and nothing less than this is at issue, the battle may as well be taken

upon 'the Prayer-for-the-Church-militant question,'—to name the most insignificant point conceivable, as on any other. Only the difficulty is to make—by-standers certainly, and sometimes, even—the combatants feel what they are contending about. In this instance, the whole world can see what is at issue—creeds, and nothing else. This is an intelligible issue. The *casus belli* is formidable, all admit. It is something that the scoffer says of 'the Church of England that it does not require merit, but *'conformity; not mind, but FAITH.'*—(*Weekly Dispatch.*) Just so: we accept the distinction, and the character which it implies. We know, and every body knows, what we are now fighting for.

Once more: in the very last case in which the Regale and Pontificale came into direct collision, and the victory—chiefly, perhaps in remembrance of the Church's sin, in the events connected with the Revolution of 1688—was with the secular power in suppressing the Church's legislative functions in Convocation, it would be an insult to the memory of even Bishop Hoadly, to suppose that the question at issue in the Bangorian controversy, great as it was, came up to that involved in the appointment of Dr. Hampden.

And if we claim in this sort of way an advantage—not that our cause is better than that of our fathers, but—that it is more intelligible, the particular form in which the secular and spiritual powers have clashed, is, perhaps, the most happy which could have been selected. If it has begun to be felt, that, whatever value and meaning the Royal Supremacy had while it was a fact, and when wielded by the vigorous hands of Tudor and Stuart in the days of Divine Right, and displayed in the mixed person of the Anointed Sovereign Lord and Master, the one and sole visible impersonation of Power, all these advantages became questionable as soon as the English Monarchy degenerated into a theory, a still more vulnerable part of the old Church-and-State system presented itself in the statute about the election of Bishops. If the Royal Supremacy itself has so far, from the stress of circumstances, and the irreversible tide of liberal opinions, changed its character, that it amounts to the Supremacy of the Prime Minister—himself an officer not recognised by statute law—and if the Supremacy of the Prime Minister is, in fact, only an accident of the polling-booths;—if this is found a difficulty hard to reconcile with a living view of a living Church, what defence could be set up for the particular mode in which this very inconsistent creature, the Supremacy, chose to exhibit itself? Human fancy in its wildest vagaries could not picture a more complete theoretical absurdity, than the English election of Bishops. To give in form a licence for a free election, and yet in fact to prescribe under the most severe penalties, even to that

of perpetual imprisonment, and loss of all preferment and worldly goods to the electors, the single person who alone must be elected—to require in the same statute the most solemn deliberation and prayer before election, and the necessity of giving due attention to the meetness of the person elected, and yet to give no choice even between two nominees—to link together fate and freedom—to put the *Congé d'Elire* whose very essence is freedom of election, and the Letters Missive the only notion of which is direct immediate nomination, into the same official envelope—to enact by statute this cumbrous farce of an election, where there is no choice, in one clause, and in the very next to provide for its failure, and to supersede it, by what would have saved all these words and parchment, the simple *sic volo sic jubeo* of letters patent—all this had only to be known to crumble away at the very lightest touch, like the buried bodies of old Etruscan kings, which sleep in solemn state and regal splendour, till the first flash of daylight melts them into something less substantial than dust itself. Whatever the present age is, it is not an age of shams and sillinesses, and mere idle old worn-out act-of-parliament paper bugaboos. And of all the insults, not so much to such a corporate existence as the Church, but to the human mind itself; of all the deplorable and melancholy monuments of folly and weakness, coupled alas! with desperate wickedness, which history has to recall, let the theory according to statute law of an Anglican Election of a Bishop bear the palm. It is nothing to say that English common sense has kept the absurdity in decent concealment; or practically has checked and neutralized it: wherever an injustice and a folly lurks, under the awful name of law, some unjust man, or some fool, somebody weak enough, or wicked enough, will be found to bring it into a little brief and noxious vigour and activity. To be sure, its first pranks are its last. The trial by duel was on the Statute Book, and some wily Old Bailey practitioner knew it, and brought it into court thirty years ago: the consequence was disastrous to society, for the murderer was let loose upon it, though the law itself was instantly repealed. So, with the statute of *Præmunire*: 'the law must take effect,' says Lord John Russell, though he knows at the very moment of uttering this pompous and pedantic phrase of tyranny, that there is not a man within the four seas who would or could defend such a monstrous, glaring, wicked absurdity.

The Statute under which English Bishops are elected—elected!—is that of 25 Henry VIII. cap. 20, sec. iv. v. vii. Its birth dates A.D. 1533; and we really believe that it was very little known except as a sort of antiquarian curiosity, till Mr. Hurrell Froude, in the year 1833, published a vigorous series of

papers upon it in the then palmy days of the 'British Magazine.' He not only analyzed the whole process, and dwelt with burning indignation on its details of oppression and absurdity, but he actually foresaw that this choice instrument of tyranny would be selected by Whig statesmen as the means of introducing the principle of Latitudinarian Bishops into the Church, to be nominated and selected simply as Latitudinarians, and as a premium upon Latitudinarianism. Forewarned, forearmed, as soon as this Statute was known, its ultimate fall was sealed. The age could not endure the hateful presence. And yet we all knew in what quarter the storm would burst; the weakest part in the old walls being once known, it required but little seership to guess where the fabric would first break down. Everybody saw that the ancient arrangement must sooner or later give way, and that the mind of the English Church could not live for ever on the dry husks of a Tudor Supremacy, especially if entrusted to the tender mercies of a Whig—possibly a Socinian—Premier. That the relations of Church and State must before long be remodelled, and that in no inconsiderable degree, all men knew, and many felt that if this reconstruction was forced upon either party in a hostile form, the Statute of Election of Bishops would be the first point of assault. And so it has turned out. We are either too earnest, or too sensible, or too stupid, or too liberal, or too practical, or too impracticable, to go on with puerile abstract theories, with grotesque contradictions to common honesty and common sense; and so the end of *præmunire* and *provisors* has begun. Its three-hundredth anniversary saw its death-blow struck—was it unawares?—by that solitary man in a solitary room at Oxford. It had prolonged its hateful and deceitful reign of compromise and shallow cold hypocrisy from 1533 to 1833: violated oaths, blasted consciences, vows bartered for pelf, the loss of Grace, the sneer of enemies, the sorrow of friends, duty explained away, and the pleadings of the Spirit, stifled, smothered, choked; these were its triumphs and its trophies. It has run its weary course of wickedness, and even now the day breaks. The prophetic period has come:—

'Hic jam ter centum totos regnabitur annos,  
Gente sub Hectorea: donec regina sacerdos,'

our own anointed Sovereign, shall erase from the Statute Book the foulest mockery which ever contaminated the name of Law.

Nor must we forget—what has been elsewhere noticed—under what remarkable associations the ancestral names of Russell and Hampden once more achieve notoriety. 'The name of Russell,' Lord John has been told, 'ought to be a security to us against the application by him of a phrase so



'sacred as the "rights of the Crown," to a matter so foul, as the 'Statute of Præmunire.' It is something more than significant that the grisly phantom of King Henry's tyranny should be evoked by a Russell in behalf of a Hampden. The cycle is about complete. One Russell shed his blood in what was called patriotism; another Russell forfeits his name for the 'Magna Charta of tyranny.' One Hampden died as a rebel and a traitor; another who bears the name, will be handed down to posterity as the voluntary champion of secular tyranny, and as the hired violator of the rights of conscience. Truly modern liberalism unites the most opposite paradoxes: the wildest license in speculation with the most arbitrary exercise of unconstitutional power. It is not for nothing that the righteous blood of More and Fisher will be avenged, in this futile attempt to revive their murderer's despotism, in the person of one whose race was first ennobled and enriched by that murderer's sacrilege and spoliation of the Church.

But what of him whose name is so prominently connected with these proceedings? Where is Dr. Hampden all this time? We have traced him as the secret spring and centre of Oxford troubles through the last dozen years; and we have found him Bishop-designate of Hereford. The prize for which he has laboured is at length within his grasp. He 'retracts nothing and disclaims nothing.' The Hampden of 1833 is the Hampden of 1847. He is at least consistent. As soon as the first sign of commotion was heard, Dr. Hampden advertised a letter to the Premier. It was to appear immediately. It was advertised in November. It is dated 9th December. It was published, a meagre seventeen pages, on 16th December. We beg to remark that the date 9th December is purely arbitrary. The Bishops' Remonstrance was in Lord John Russell's possession at least before the 8th, for his reply bears that date. Does Dr. Hampden pretend that he published his pamphlet in ignorance of the address of the thirteen Bishops? No; he assigned an early date to his letter in order that it might pass for being written antecedently to the Bishops' appeal. And yet even this clever device was rather too clever: it was transparent. Is the Oxford press so slow—by the way the letter bears no imprint—that it took seven days to print, and stitch, and publish a single sheet? Everybody knows what printers can do when the author has the will. The Bishop of Exeter could not have seen—did not see—Lord John's reply to the laity till the morning of the 13th, and yet his vigorous postscript was written—for it bears that date—and, together with the whole pamphlet, was set up, worked off, and published, before seven o'clock on the evening of this very 13th. Dr. Hampden must have seen the Bishops'

letter before his own was published, we believe before it was even in type. But that document was a fact either too inconvenient to grapple with, or too trivial to notice. At any rate, he condescends to pass it over *sub silentio*. These details are characteristic, and display temper.

Of the substance of Dr. Hampden's Letter we hardly trust ourselves to speak with patience. Even his friends—such as the 'Daily News'—condemned it as poor and unsatisfactory. In composition it is only a frigid repetition of the inaugural lecture; in language it is hesitating and perplexed. It is written under the ugly necessity of saying something with actually nothing to say. In substance, it may be divided into three parts—a vindication of himself as personally orthodox; a Pharisaic recapitulation of his own many virtues and claims to preferment; and a bitter personal attack upon his enemies.

As to Dr. Hampden's personal orthodoxy, we have not a word to say. The charge against him—it has never varied, or betrayed itself into inconsistency—is, not that he is a Socinian, but that he has advocated a theory more mischievous and wider than Socinianism itself. It is not the simple vice of heresy on this or that article of the Creed that he is charged with, but the larger principle of the non-necessity of any creeds. He is accused not of a false dogmatism, but of anti-dogmatism, which is a far heavier imputation. He denies the saving necessity of any strict theological doctrine. Like his friend and apologist, Mr. Winstanley Hull,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hampden may say, 'I fully believe, after a long and careful investigation, the Catholic faith to be what is commonly stated in the Creed commonly called the Creed of Athanasius; but,' he will add, 'it is most positively false that he who does not keep that faith whole and undefiled shall, without doubt, perish everlastingly.' For, 'the damnable clauses are not in the Bible, nor can they be proved thereby.' So Dr. Hampden may say (p. 9), 'Most sincerely and most firmly do I believe that there is but one Catholic faith—one invariable standard of orthodox truth; and that all departures from this, consequently, are Errors of Doctrine and Corruptions of the Truth, and not that "form of sound words" which God has set forth to us in his Revelation.' Probably:—Dr. Hampden and Mr. Hull are very fortunate. By a happy accident their personal convictions happen to be exactly coincident and identical with the Athanasian statements. But this is not the question: the *ignoratio elenchi* is too wilful and patent. What of those whose 'long and careful investigation,' just as honest, and as scrupulous, and as patient as Dr. Hampden's, has led them

<sup>1</sup> 1845. The month of January. Oxford, p. 15.

to an opposite conclusion? What, for example, of Dr. Hampden's friend and guide, Mr. Blanco White? Was he dishonest, or careless, or ignorant, or superficial? What of the common run of Socinians? Why, as he has 'nothing to retract, nothing to disclaim,' he still 'ventures to call Unitarians' not only 'Christians,' but 'our brethren in the faith,' although 'they will not assent to his metaphysical conclusions.' The question is, not about Dr. Hampden's faith, but, about the saving efficacy of these very 'metaphysical conclusions.' And it is in this way that we think the quotations and extracts from Dr. Hampden's works do not adequately state the charge against him. It is not in the nature of the case that they can do so. It is not that they are garbled and one-sided, but they are insufficient. Bad as Dr. Hampden's theology may appear by a series of extracts, infinitely worse is it by a steady perusal of his Bampton Lectures. The book is not a counter argument against any decision of the Church, but a long elaborate argument to show that the Church had no inherent right to conclude, infer, state, prove, or impose at all. He passes by this or that dogmatic assertion with contemptuous indifference: he may happen, by his own private process of reasoning, to agree with it; others may not. There is neither merit nor blame on either side; for 'no conclusions' of human reason, however correctly deduced, however logically 'sound, are properly religious truths,' and 'it by no means' follows, that what can be proved out of Scripture, must, therefore, be truth of Revelation,' since 'all belief as such is involuntary.' If a man 'professes and calls himself' a Christian, he is a Christian 'in the charitable sense of the term,'—a sense in which he may be reckoned among 'our brethren in the faith,' a sense in which his 'mode of reasoning' will not hurt him.

But a view of Dr. Hampden's theology is incomplete without adverting to its tendencies. The name of Mr. Blanco White suggests something more than an anticipation of what it would run to with a free course for its development. Dr. Hampden's own career can only be fairly judged by a careful attention to that of his friend and monitor, Mr. Blanco White. This gentleman supplies the practical conclusion to Dr. Hampden's theoretical premises. We avail ourselves of the opportunity of placing, in a more permanent and accessible position, the facts contained in an able article which appeared in the 'Times' of Christmas Day:—

'We do not know who are Dr. Hampden's present advisers, or whether that gentleman is open to counsel at all, but we think it must strike everybody how much service they would render to him and to the Church, if they could induce him to publish, not a retractation, but just a candid review of his Bampton Lectures. There are not many men who will *retract* when they have once been put on their mettle. But there are many men, many living men, who have committed themselves on theological, political,

economical, and even on physical questions, and have afterwards "told truth and shamed the devil" by avowing the results of maturer and more deliberate inquiry. There is, indeed, scarcely any man of any mark in the kingdom who has not given that last proof of sincerity which is implied in a frank renunciation of error. Opinion is a matter not only of intuitive perception, or immediate inspiration, but of the school, of the society, of friends, of books, of particular incidents, of accidental meetings, of casual occupations, of innumerable other disposing circumstances. A man may be very truthful, but struggling as yet with accidental error, and clouded with the medium in which he happens to live, or he may, unawares, have adopted arguments or expressions which are far from doing justice to his character and sentiments. Now, if there ever was a man of whom this was probable, it is Dr. Hampden. His friends are constantly reminding us that he has not written, either before or since, anything like his Bampton Lectures, and the two or three lesser publications which followed immediately in the wake of that celebrated volume. That itself proves that he could now bestow upon his work that nine years' castigation recommended by the Roman critic, without any very serious sacrifice of his theological identity and credit.

'In point of fact Dr. Hampden wrote those lectures under very peculiar stimulus, suggestion, and aid. We very much question whether they can correctly be called his own. As far as regards the selection of the subject, the mode in which it is treated, the authors used and worked into the text, the scrutiny applied to the creeds and other formularies of the Church, and, above all, the tendency of the work, it has more claim to be considered Mr. Blanco White's than Dr. Hampden's. During the latter end of 1831 and the early part of 1832—that is, for eight or nine months preceding the delivery of the lectures—Dr. Hampden was a frequent, it was said at the time an almost daily, visitor at the lodgings of that singular and most interesting person. It so happened that both had become very much separated from the college of which they were members. The gulf of controversy which afterwards so fearfully expanded then already yawned. Indeed, controversy was at an end between poor Mr. Blanco White and the leading members of the common room of his college. They too well understood one another's position. Illness, nervousness, bodily and mental torture, nourished by a strange mixture of harrowing self-scrutinies and petty vexations of a less dignified character, kept that amiable and most unfortunate gentleman for many months a prisoner to his room. Dr. Whately went to Dublin in October 1831, taking with him Dr. Hinds, and breaking up the bright little circle of which he was the sun, if a character so eccentric can be associated with ideas of unity and order. Mr. Blanco White was then solitary indeed, as the few who relieved his solitude well knew.

'Dr. Hampden was one of them. He had attached himself to what used to be called the Oriel School, before it was eclipsed by a more serious and extensive development. It is natural to suppose, that he did not feel that positive antipathy to poor Blanco White's speculations, and that slender respect for his critical and philosophical acumen, which by this time prevailed in that college. He felt a qualified confidence in his guide. When the tendency and inner meaning of Mr. Blanco White's conversation had long been evident, even to the most youthful of his acquaintance, it is difficult to suppose that Dr. Hampden did not see the precipice on which he was treading. Indeed, it subsequently appeared from Mr. Blanco White's own strictures on the result, that Dr. Hampden must have been frequently conscious of a point at which he and his Gamaliel could no longer keep company. Dr. Hampden, probably saw in Mr. Blanco White what others saw too clearly—a mind shaken, unhinged, perplexed, wounded, never to be

healed; subject to violent reactions; indignant at all tyranny of opinion and carried to extremes of resistance, and even of retaliation, where liberty of conscience was concerned. He probably found, that he derived the most valuable assistance from these colloquies, and trusted that, in the composition of his lectures, he could make all the proper deductions for Mr. Blanco White's excesses of opinion, of expression, or of temper. It was natural, at least, that he should make the attempt.

'When the course of lectures had been preached, and at length published, it was obvious at once to all who had been familiar with Mr. Blanco White's conversation, that one was only a version of the other. The subjects, the theories, the key words, the books, the very passages were common to the lecturer and the talker. It was evident to several individuals, that what Mr. Blanco White had been frequently urging them to take in hand, Dr. Hampden had at length the industry, the resolution, or the courage to essay. They recognised at once that attempt to apply the Baconian induction to the "scriptural fact," in which poor Mr. Blanco White had long been floundering. They recognised the very letter of the arguments and illustrations urged by Mr. Blanco White against the definitions, distinctions, and conclusions of the schools. That gentleman had some time before undertaken for the 'Theological Library,' a 'History of the Inquisition,' which he had early developed into a history of religious dogmatism from the Apostolic age. We possess the fruits of his labours in his 'Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy.' Some time before this he had also determined to publish a translation of Aristotle's 'Organon,' with notes and illustrations from the human mind, and from the ancient and mediæval modes of thought. Before 1832 he had completed his notes; or, at least, had written as much matter as it would be expedient to publish. The translation, however, flagged. Neither has appeared that we know of. Not long after this he actually published 'The Law of Anti-Religious Libel Re-considered.' These works we mention to account for the peculiar turn of Mr. Blanco White's reading and speculations in 1831—1832. He had also been reading with enthusiasm, and urging upon his visitors, 'Guizot's History,' and Victor Cousin; of both of whom, as also other French writers, numerous traces appear in the lectures.

'While the lectures were in hand, and these confabulations were in progress, Mr. Blanco White frequently alluded to them with considerable excitement as the steps to a great disclosure that would astonish the University. He became nervous, indeed, at the probable recoil of the attempt, but entertained no doubt that a great advance would be made to the overthrow of religious dogmatism. After the delivery of the lectures, he expressed considerable disappointment, and instanced places in the discussion where the lecturer "stopped." His words were—"Dr. Hampden is a rising man, and cannot afford to go farther." There is, however, no reason to believe that Dr. Hampden had ever given him real grounds to expect that he would "go farther;" and poor Mr. Blanco White was not unlikely to feel somewhat aggrieved at finding his labours neither openly recognised nor thoroughly effectuated. Those were his expressions, and their tone was not respectful or friendly to Dr. Hampden, though, when the latter became the subject of a theological "persecution," he felt unqualified interest in the fortunes of his temporary pupil.

'These lectures we believe to be as much the products of Mr. Blanco White's mind as certain works penned by Xenophon and Plato are virtually the thoughts of Socrates. There is, indeed, a considerable difference of style between the lectures and Mr. Blanco White's published works even on the same subjects; but they who were acquainted with that extraordinary person will remember that he talked and wrote very differently. He spoke with vigour and terseness, and with his eye upon his subject. When he

took up his pen, however, he became immediately surrounded and enfeebled by the gloomy shades of his mental experience, and his many sore grievances with the world. We entertain no doubt that a critical comparison of the Bampton Lectures with Mr. Blanco White's subsequent publications and posthumous Remains will be found to bear out the above statement.

'The lectures were written in 1831-32. Mr. Blanco White, in his published account of his mental history, says, that from 1829 to the publication of his '*Heresy and Orthodoxy*,' in 1835, in which he finally renounced the Trinitarian doctrine, his creed was a "modification of the Sabellian theory," which he explains and pronounces to be a "devout contrivance" that will not bear examination. He discovered that his faith had been *really* "Unitarianism disguised in words." He subsequently became a Deist, and an anxious, devout, inquiring, and most miserable Deist, he died.

'Now, we submit to Dr. Hampden himself, whether these facts do not both require an explanation on his part, and also facilitate it. What is easier than to point out for the benefit of those who may not possess Dr. Hampden's powers of "stopping" in time where he has been led too far by his treacherous guide, where he should have "stopped" rather earlier, where the ground is dangerous, where an argument is presumptuous, or an expression irreverent? By doing this he will neutralize the mischief he may have done, and may still do, and also put a favourable conclusion to this most painful controversy.'

Dr. Hampden in his letter next takes occasion to call attention to his 'devoted service in the ministry of the Gospel for more than a quarter of a century.' He then thinks proper to parallel himself with 'the apostles themselves, following their Lord 'in his persecutions, who were reviled and evil-entreated by 'their brethren.' Also he informs us, that Bull and Hooker suffered under misrepresentations; and enthymematically suggests that he is a persecuted believer also. And finally, that his class was not deserted, nor himself hissed when ascending the pulpit of Christ Church: which assurances, together with the impregnable fact that 'thousands have heard his Sermons and his Lectures,' we leave in all their modest majesty to speak for themselves, in company with Lord John Russell's gratifying notification, that 'he has preached sermons, for 'which he has been honoured with the approbation of several 'prelates of our Church;' a fact which could only have been extorted from the hesitating and coy confession of the preacher himself.

Into the last division of Dr. Hampden's defence it is simply annoying to follow him. His opponents are infected with 'the jealousies and heart-burnings of the polemical spirit,' they habitually violate the ninth commandment—their objections arise from 'the corrupt human heart, a warrant for any excess of uncharitableness and even for untruths.' Their charges are 'base,' and 'calumny;' his 'adversaries are reckless,' 'prejudiced,' guilty of 'misrepresentation,' and 'perversion;' are 'artful,' 'hostile and uncandid,' 'cruel,' 'sophistical;' they



resort to 'false colouring;' they are 'dishonest,' 'invidious,' and act from 'animosity,' and are guilty of 'wrong;' they are 'anonymous slanderers in newspapers.' And all this he can say while 'appealing to the All-Seeing God, who tries the heart.' Now the office of a Bishop is, to 'maintain and set forward quietness, love, and peace, among all men.' This *florilegium maledictionis*, may well speak for itself: we have allowed Dr. Hampden to be his own portrait-painter; he has projected his own image: he has supplied his own illumination and attitude: and there is no likeness so severely faithful as that of the photograph.

But there are some omissions in this letter to which we must in justice advert. First, there is not a word of retraction—not a word of regret, that through his unfortunate style the peace of the Church has been disturbed—not a syllable of sympathy for those who were likely to incur loss of worldly goods for a conscientious suspicion of the soundness of his writings. No, Dr. Merewether's 'corrupt human heart' has led him to risk shipwreck of peace and family duties, and the noble work of rebuilding his cathedral—possibly to forego station and honour, even the very means of life—for the sake of indulging, we suppose, in 'base calumny' and 'reckless prejudice.' Why—we earnestly ask,—does Dr. Hampden now maintain his sullen silence? Why does he cling to the promotion which he knows can never be completed, if completed at all, without such a mass of complicated suffering and distress, and contumely, and rebuke and blasphemy, separation and sin, as would make the very coldest heart uneasy and melancholy in contemplating it? Where is the conscience—where is the self-denial, where the patient suffering, which can behold all this unmoved and unappealing? Could not Dr. Hampden himself have some consideration for this? Does he delight in forecasting the chains which are to be riveted for the Church? Does the ring of anvil and forge in his ears please him? and, so long as he mounts the throne, is he indifferent to peace?

To conclude: the Oxford censure was 'an unworthy proceeding'—Dr. Hampden is not 'under the censure of the University'—it is 'an illegal measure.'<sup>1</sup> Not only does he know,

<sup>1</sup> Thomassin, tom. ii. p. 648 (of the French edition), considers universities as founded by Bishops; and he especially instances the University of Paris, which he regards as the model and type of all Universities; and therefore he concludes that theological censures belong to them in right of their constitution. Du Boulay (Bulæus), who wrote the 'History of the University of Paris,' gives instances of the exercise of this right. Antony à Wood mentions several Oxford condemnations of the Lollards, and says that the Pope gave the University power to *license preachers*. The famous Oxford Decree is well known. Another case is remarkably parallel to Dr. Hampden's. Arthur Bury was Prebendary of Exeter, Rector

none more accurately, that the particular form of the *privilegium* was submitted to by its promoters, and was actually planned by his personal associates and friends, only in, mistaken we fear, deference to his own feelings, and with a laxity, yet tenderness, of expression of which he now adroitly avails himself, but which was then hoped might alleviate the pain which it could not but inflict: but yet more, he knows that the first impulse of an honourable and generous heart when labouring under an unfounded imputation is instantly to have the case decided by law. The law is open: has he ever named the *venue*—has he challenged a 'legal' measure? in what way would he like the University to express a worthy judgment—or, if he has all along thought its judgment in any form illegal, courts of law would have condemned it—has he appealed to the Queen in her courts of Westminster? He appealed to the Archbishop, and when that prelate's judgment, in a published correspondence, was declared against him, did he reply in other terms than those scarcely short of rebuke? If Dr. Hampden has been illegally judged, what steps has he taken to set the judgment aside? Once, indeed, he appealed to the very tribunal which condemned him, thereby admitting its competency, and he only gained a repetition of it. While many premiers have promoted many Bishops *unqualified*, and while Lord John Russell has the distinction of having selected the only man in England who was *disqualified*, it would have been more dignified and worthy of his responsible station to have compelled his nominee to prove that such disqualification—which while it remains unreversed is a fact—was illegal. A verdict is not undone by railing at it, and calling the judge and jury knaves and fools; but it can always be set aside by a new trial, or a Court of Error.

And here, as far as Dr. Hampden is concerned, this history must leave him, with the fact that the election at Hereford is not canonically completed, and cannot be confirmed in the Archbishop's Court. The case itself is beginning to be understood: Dr. Hampden himself has long since been understood: and the noble conduct of Dean Merewether and Canon Huntingford, and the lustre which such a manly conscientious deed sheds upon the whole Church, is even now candidly and honestly owned by portions of the daily press which have been hitherto among Dr. Hampden's most strenuous supporters. There can be but one opinion both of that act and of the final issue of a cause of

---

of Exeter College, and King's Chaplain, in 1665. During the time (1690) that he was Pro-Vice-Chancellor, he printed, under that authority, a Socinian book, called the 'Naked Gospel.' For this publication, he was ejected from Exeter College, and his book was burned at Oxford, by order of Convocation.

which it forms the most distinguished event : and that is, at the very lowest, a most hopeful and an encouraging one.

These great struggles tell a high lesson of faith and patience. Commenced simply under an intolerable and burning sense of painful yet imperious duty, with only a partial and immediate application, they must end, if pursued in singleness and sincerity of heart, in good issues. Who could have thought that such high and enthusiastic displays of feeling, as we have lately had, could have been elicited by one dull mischievous book? We get into fixed habits of thought and assumption—cold and ungenerous ones—that our actual modes and forms of constriction and conventionalities are tied down by some iron necessity—that nothing can break through the hard system of centuries. And then a single act of duty breaks the fatal spell—the world of unrealities, and sophistries, and make-shifts, is disenchanted, and high thoughts come into the Church's mind. And these things, now as ever, tell upon the world and win even its reluctant applause; and the Church's inner life comes out; and the cold mist of apathy lifts, and the bright blue heavens and sharp mountain peaks of progress are disclosed. Such is the might and mystery of duty and self-sacrifice. Deeds of duty cannot be explained away; few try to do it; none succeed in such a misrepresentation. Even now it may be that complete success will not crown the present events: a compromise may ensue: modifications, not a break up, of the system are to be immediately expected, or are to be wished for. Old feelings and stages of thought must die out: they are at present moribund and tottering, but not dead. And yet the real substantial victory is ours: hearts are strengthened—calumny and misunderstanding are put to silence. Our position is decided. We know Whose we are, and Who is with us. It is by protests, struggles, hoping against hope, by resolute endurance, by winning even a single difficult post and maintaining it, that its triumphs of faith are achieved by the Church. In the thrilling heart, and kindling eye, and burning words of confidence and hope in friends are to be sought the substantial fruits of toil. And if these are already ours—as who shall deny?—the ingathering of the harvest of which such are the first-fruits, may be left to other hands to garner: and for all the disappointments, and disasters, and checks, and downcast thoughts of the past we may well consent to be thankful.

## APPENDIX.

### I.—PROTEST OF THE BISHOPS.

‘My Lord,—We, the undersigned Bishops of the Church of England, feel it our duty to represent to your Lordship, as head of her Majesty’s Government, the apprehension and alarm which have been excited in the minds of the Clergy by the rumoured nomination to the See of Hereford of Dr. Hampden, in the soundness of whose doctrine the University of Oxford has affirmed, by a solemn decree, its want of confidence.

‘We are persuaded that your Lordship does not know how deep and general a feeling prevails on this subject; and we consider ourselves to be acting only in the discharge of our bounden duty, both to the Crown and to the Church, when we respectfully but earnestly express to your Lordship our conviction that, if this appointment be completed, there is the greatest danger both of the interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most desirable that the Clergy and laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the Royal Supremacy, especially as regards that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to vacant Sees.

‘We have the honour to be, my Lord,

‘Your Lordship’s obedient faithful Servants,

‘C. J. LONDON,	J. H. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL,
C. WINTON,	H. EXETER,
J. LINCOLN,	E. SARUM,
CHR. BANGOR.	A. T. CHICHESTER,
HUGH CARLISLE,	T. ELY,
G. ROCHESTER,	SAML. OXON.
RICH. BATH AND WELLS,	

‘To the Right Hon. the Lord John Russell,  
&c. &c. &c.

### II.—LORD JOHN RUSSELL’S REPLY.

‘Chesham Place, December 8th, 1847.

‘My Lords,—I have the honour to receive a representation signed by your Lordships, on the subject of the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford.

‘I observe that your Lordships do not state any want of confidence on your part in the soundness of Dr. Hampden’s doctrine. Your Lordships refer me to a decree of the University of Oxford, passed eleven years ago, and founded upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago.

‘Since the date of that decree, Dr. Hampden has acted as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and many Bishops, as I am told, have required certificates of attendance on his lectures before they proceeded to ordain candidates who had received their education at Oxford. He has likewise preached sermons, for which he has been honoured with the approbation of several Prelates of our Church.

'Several months before I named Dr. Hampden to the Queen for the See of Hereford, I signified my intention to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and did not receive from him any discouragement.

'In these circumstances, it appears to me that should I withdraw my recommendation of Dr. Hampden, which has been sanctioned by the Queen, I should virtually assent to the doctrine, that a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a Clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life, and that, in fact, the supremacy which is now by law vested in the Crown is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of our Universities.

'Nor should it be forgotten, that many of the most prominent among that majority have since joined the communion of the Church of Rome.

'I deeply regret the feeling that is said to be common among the Clergy on this subject. But I cannot sacrifice the reputation of Dr. Hampden, the rights of the Crown, and what I believe to be the true interests of the Church, to a feeling which I believe to be founded on misapprehension and fomented by prejudice.

'At the same time I thank your Lordships for an interposition which I believe to be intended for the public benefit.

'I have, &c.

'J. RUSSELL.'

*'To the Right Rev. the Bishop of London, Winchester, Lincoln, &c.'*

### III.—PROTEST OF THE LAITY.

'My Lord,—We, the undersigned Lay-Members of the Church of England, beg leave to represent to your Lordship the deep concern with which we have heard the report of your intention to recommend Dr. Hampden to Her Majesty as the future Bishop of Hereford.

'We have seen and heard enough of the strong feeling both of Laymen and of Clergy on this occasion, to convince us that the appointment, if persisted in, will stir up feelings of bitterness, which it would be impossible soon to eradicate, and which would probably lead to consequences which your Lordship would deprecate as earnestly as ourselves.

'We fervently hope that these, or other reasons, may induce your Lordship to reconsider the case, before you finally advise Her Majesty to recommend, for election to the vacant Bishopric, a person who has been solemnly pronounced by his own University to be unworthy of its confidence as a Teacher of Christian Truth.

We are, My Lord,

*'To the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P.'*

'&c. &c.'

### IV.—LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S REPLY.

*'Chesham Place, December 10th, 1847.'*

'My Lords and Gentlemen,—I have had the honour to receive your representation on the subject of my recommendation of Dr. Hampden to the Queen, for the see of Hereford.

'I am aware that there exists a strong feeling on the part of some Laymen and Clergymen against Dr. Hampden; but that the appointment should excite feelings of bitterness, is, I hope an error, as it would show a sad want of Christian charity on the part of those who would indulge such feelings.

'The consequences with which I am threatened, I am prepared to encounter, as I believe the appointment will tend to strengthen the Protestant character of our Church, so seriously threatened of late by many defections to the Church of Rome. Among the chief of these defections

are to be found the leading promoters of the movement against Dr. Hampden, eleven years ago, in the University of Oxford.

'I had hoped the conduct of Dr. Hampden, as Regius Professor of Divinity, and Head of a Theological Board at Oxford, had effaced the memory of that unworthy proceeding.

'I have the honour to be, my Lords and Gentlemen,  
'Your obedient Servant,  
'J. RUSSELL.'

*'To certain Lay-Members of the Church of England.'*

## V.

'Palace, Ripon, Dec. 2, 1847.

'My dear Lord,—Although I do not feel myself at liberty to adopt all the expressions contained in the memorial about to be presented from several of my episcopal brethren to the head of her Majesty's Government on the subject of the rumoured nomination of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford, I would, nevertheless, desire to join in most respectfully but earnestly expressing my conviction, that unless his lordship can be induced to pause before he presses on the election of Dr. Hampden, and to wait until some means be found of proving the groundlessness of those apprehensions which it has excited, there is the greatest danger of the further interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of that confidence which it is most desirable that the clergy and the laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the royal supremacy.

'Believe me, my dear Lord,

'Your very faithful friend and brother,

(Signed)

'C. T. RIPON.'

*'The Lord Bishop of London.'*

## VI.—TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

'May it please your Majesty,—We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subject, John Merewether, Doctor in Divinity, Dean of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, most humbly lay before your Majesty the assurances of our deepest and most heartfelt attachment to your Majesty's sacred person and government.

'We thank your Majesty for having graciously granted to us your royal licence to elect a Bishop of our Church, in place of the Right Rev. Father in God Thomas, late Bishop thereof, and for "*requiring and commanding us, by the faith and allegiance by which we stand bound to your Majesty, that we elect SUCH A PERSON AS MAY BE DEVOTED TO GOD, and useful and faithful to your Majesty and your kingdom.*"

'We also duly recognise the goodness of your Majesty in accompanying this your royal licence with letters missive, graciously announcing to us that out of "*your princely disposition and zeal you are desirous,*" as we cannot doubt, "*to prefer unto the same See a person MEET THEREUNTO.*"

'And we further acknowledge your Majesty's gracious intention towards us, in "*NAMING and RECOMMENDING unto us*" by the same letters missive, Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, your Majesty's Reader in Theology in your University of Oxford, to be by us "*ELECTED and CHOSEN unto the said Bishopric*"

'But we most humbly beseech your Majesty to permit us, as in duty bound, and in obedience to your Majesty's gracious command touching the qualities of the person to be chosen by us, to represent (and, if it be deemed necessary, by sufficient documents to prove), that somewhat more than eleven years ago, the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, then being the late King William's Reader of Theology, the said University did, as by its laws,



rights, and privileges, and by the law of the land it is empowered, and on fit occasion bound to do, judge of the published writings of the said Dr. Hampden, and did solemnly decree, and by a statute in its House of Convocation duly made did enact that the said Dr. Hampden should be deprived of certain weighty functions, importing the right of judging of sound teaching and preaching of God's word, which had been specially annexed by former statutes of the said University to his office therein; to wit, "that he be in the number of those by whom are appointed the select preachers before the University,"—and, further, that his counsel be taken in case of any preacher being called (as by the statutes of the said University every preacher who may have delivered any unsound or suspected doctrine in any of his preachings is liable to be called) into question before the Vice-Chancellor.' And such deprivation of Dr. Hampden was expressly declared in the said statute to have been decreed, '*because in his said published writings he has so treated matters theological, that in this respect the University hath no confidence in him.*'

'Furthermore, six years afterwards the Convocation of the said University, having been called together to consider the question of the fitness of repealing the said statute, so that the said Dr. Hampden might be restored to the functions of which he had been as aforesaid deprived, the said Convocation did thereupon solemnly decree that the statute should not be repealed, but should still be (and, accordingly, it still continues to be) in full force and vigour; whereby the said Dr. Hampden stands to this day denounced by the judgment of the said University as "*devoid altogether of its confidence in matters theological, by the reason of the manner in which those matters have been treated by him in his published writings.*"

'And here we deem it our duty to your Majesty humbly to submit, that not only by the people and Church of England, but by all your Majesty's royal predecessors, the solemn decisions of either of your Majesty's Universities of Oxford and Cambridge on questions and matters of theology have always been deemed to carry with them very high authority, and that such is the renown of these your Majesty's famous Universities throughout the reformed portion of Christendom, that everywhere their judgment is heard with reverence and honour.

'Neither may we omit dutifully to lay before your Majesty, that to the office of a Bishop, to which we are commanded by your Majesty to choose "*a person meet to be elected,*" essentially adheres the duty of judging of the doctrine of the clergy committed to his charge, especially of those who are to be instituted or licensed by him to the cure of souls—which high duty the University of Oxford has decreed, as aforesaid, that Dr. Hampden is, in its judgment, unfit to have confided to him; the distressing and disastrous consequences which must be expected to result from placing the diocese of Hereford, by the strong hand of power, under a person so characterised by so high authority, we are as unwilling as it would be painful to recount.

'For all these reasons, and not least because, in common as we believe with almost every considerate Churchman, we are desirous and anxious that the prerogative of the Crown in nominating to bishoprics should be for ever established on its only firm foundation—the confidence of the Church in the wisdom, the justice, the purity, the considerate and conscientious moderation with which it is exercised—we most humbly pray your Majesty to name and recommend some other person whom your Majesty shall think meet to be elected by us for our Bishop, or that your Majesty will graciously relieve us from the necessity of proceeding to the election till you shall have been pleased to submit Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden's published writings (so judged as aforesaid by the Convocation of the University of Oxford) to the judgment either of the two Houses of Convocation of Clergy of the province of Canterbury which is now sitting, or of the Provincial

Council of Bishops of the same province, assisted by such divines as your Majesty or the said Provincial Council shall be pleased to call, or of some other competent tribunal which your Majesty shall be graciously pleased to appoint. In order whereunto we have appointed for the day of election the 28th day of December instant, being the eleventh day from the receipt of your Majesty's *Congé d'Elire*, and the last which we can lawfully appoint.

'And we are the more emboldened to lay this, our humble supplication, at the feet of your Majesty by your known cordial attachment to our holy and apostolic Church, and by your faithful and uniform observance of the oath made by your Majesty at your coronation—"That you will maintain and preserve to the utmost of your power the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof."

'And even if it could be imagined that these last-mentioned considerations apply not to our case, we should nevertheless confidently rely on your Majesty's experienced regard for that dearest and most sacred right of every class and description of your subjects, the right of liberty of conscience, and on your having at the head of your Majesty's councils a noble lord, the proudest boast of whose illustrious house, as well as of his own public life, it hitherto has been to assert that right for all men against all opponents—a right which would in our persons be trampled to the very dust if, in spite of all our just and reasonable reclamations, we be coerced under the threatened penalties of *præmunire* to elect for our Bishop a person whom we cannot conscientiously believe, so long as the aforesaid judgment stands against him, to be "meet to be elected" to that most holy office.

'In conclusion, we would add our fervent prayer, as well as our most earnest hope, that your Majesty may long be permitted by the King of kings to reign in the hearts of all your subjects the approved "Defender of the Faith," "ruling all estates and degrees of men amongst us, whether ecclesiastical or temporal," as is your sacred and undoubted right—giving alike to all experience of the blessings of your just and beneficent government, and receiving from all the willing homage of grateful and confiding love.

'In witness whereunto we have affixed our decanal seal this 17th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1847.'

(L. S.)

#### VII.—SIR GEORGE GREY'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

'Whitehall, Dec. 20, 1847.

'Sir,—Lord John Russell having placed in my hands the petition addressed by you to her Majesty, and transmitted in your letter to him of the 17th instant,

'I have had the honour to lay the same before the Queen, and I am to inform you that her Majesty has not been pleased to issue any commands thereupon.

'I have, &c.

'G. GREY.

'*The Very Rev. the Dean of Hereford.*'

#### VIII.—DEAN MEREWETHER'S LETTER TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

'My Lord,—I have had the honour to receive your lordship's letter, announcing that you had received my memorial to the Queen, and that you had transmitted it to Sir G. Grey for presentation to her Majesty; and by the same post I also receive the information that Sir G. Grey had laid the same before the Queen, and that "he was to inform me that her Majesty had not been pleased to issue any commands thereupon." Under these circumstances I feel compelled once more to trouble your lordship with a few remarks,

‘Throughout the correspondence in which I have had the honour to be engaged with your lordship, as well as in the interview which you were pleased to afford me on the subject of the appointment to the See of Hereford, it has been my object frankly and faithfully to declare to you the facts which have come to my knowledge, and the honest conviction of my mind. I desire still to act upon the same principle, and to submit to your lordship finally, and as briefly as possible, the following considerations, upon which I feel constrained to adopt a course which, however I may apprehend it will not be entirely congenial to your lordship’s wishes, will, under circumstances in which I am placed, obtain from your lordship’s candour the admission that it is the only course which I could pursue.

‘I crave your lordship’s indulgence whilst I enumerate the especial obligations to which I am bound, and I state them in the order of their occurrence.

‘When matriculated to the University of Oxford, of which I am still a member, the following oath was administered to me, as well as on taking each of my degrees:—“Tu dabis fidem ad observandum omnia statuta, privilegia, et consuetudines hujus Universitatis; ita Deus te adjuvet tactis sacrosanctis Christi Evangeliiis.”

‘Again—when I was admitted to the sacred orders of priest in the church of God, a part of my ordination vow was expressed in these words—that I would “banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God’s word.”

‘Again—when I was inducted, on occasion of the installation to the office which I hold in the cathedral church of Hereford, as I stepped over the threshold of the fabric, the restoration of which, for the due honour of Almighty God, it has been my pride and anxious endeavour to promote, I was required to charge my soul with this responsibility:—“Ego, Joannes Merewether, Decanus Herefordensis, ab hac horâ in antea, fidelis ero huic sacrosanctæ Herefordensi ecclesiæ, necnon jura, libertates, privilegia, et consuetudines ejusdem, pro viribus observabo et ea manutenebo et defendam pro posse meo; sic me Deus adjavet, et hæc sancta Evangelia.”

‘My lord, I cannot divest my mind of the awful sense of the stringency of those engagements at the present exigency. Let me entreat your lordship’s patience whilst I endeavour to explain my apprehension of them.

‘In my letter of the 1st of December, in reply to the second which your lordship was pleased to address to me—and which correspondence I trust your lordship will permit me publicly to refer to, in vindication of my conduct, should need require it—I observed, “In regard to Dr. Hampden’s tenets, I would abstain from any opinion upon them till I have again fairly and attentively read his writings.” That act of justice I have carefully performed, and I will add with an earnest desire to discover grounds upon which, in case of Dr. Hampden’s ever occupying the high station for which he has been selected by your lordship, my mind might be relieved from all distrust, and I might be enabled as cordially as possible to render that service which the relative duties of diocesan and dean and chapter involve.

‘It is painful in the extreme to feel obliged to declare that I discover in those writings many *assertions*—not merely references to theories or impressions of others—but *assertions*, which to my calm and deliberate appreciation appear to be heterodoxical, I believe I may say heretical, and very, very much, which is most dangerous, most objectionable, calculated to weaken the hold which the religion we possess as yet obtains, and ought to obtain always, upon the minds of its professors. I feel certain that the perusal of several of these works by any of that class who, “by reason of use” (in cautious examination of such productions) “have not their senses exercised to discern both good and evil,” would produce a doubt and distrust in the teaching of our Church—in her creeds—her formularies—her

liturgy; would rob them of the inestimable joy and peace in believing, and be highly detrimental to the spread of true religion.

'Such being my conviction, I would ask your lordship how it must affect my conscience in reference to those solemn obligations which I have already detailed? I have sworn that I will observe all the statutes of the University of which I am still a member. The statute of that University touching this matter stands in the following words, at this moment uncanceled, unrepealed:—"Quin ab universitate commissum fuerit, S. Theologiæ Professori Regio, ut unus sit ex eorum numero a quibus designantur selecti concionatores, secundum Tit. XVI., 58 (Addend. p. 150), necnon ut ejus concilium ad hibeatur si quis concionator coram Vice-Cancellario in questionem vacatur, secundum Tit. XVI. s. 11 (Addend. p. 151), quam vero qui nunc Professor, et scriptis suis publici juris factis, ita res theologiæ tractaverit, et in hac parte nullam ejus duciam habeat Universitas; statutum est, quod munerum prædictorum expers sit S. Theologiæ Professor Regius, donec aliter Universitati placuerit, ne vero quid detrimenti capiat interea Universitas, Professoris ejusdem vicibus fungantur alii, scilicet, in concionatores selectos designando senior inter Vice-Cancellarii deputatos, vel eo absente, aut ipsius Vice-Cancellarii locum tenente, proximus ex omine deputatus (proviso semper quod sacros ordines succiperit) et in concilio de concionibus habendo, Prælector Domine Margarette Comitissæ Richmondiæ." Should I not be guilty of deliberate perjury, if, in direct defiance of such a decree, I did any act which should place the object of it in such a position as to be not only the judge of the soundness of the theological opinions and preaching of a whole diocese, but of those whom, from time to time, he must admit to cure of souls, and even to the sacred orders of the ministry?

'I have sworn, at the most awful moment of my life, that I will "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word." It may be replied, that this engagement applies to the ministrations in the cure of souls, inherent only in parochial functions; but the statutes of our cathedral church constitute me one of the guardians of the soundness of the doctrine which may be preached in that sacred edifice:—"Si quid a quopiam pro concione proferatur, quod cum verbo Dei, articulis Religionis, aut Liturgiæ Anglicanæ consentire non videtur, eâ de re, Decanus atque Residentiarii, quod quot audierint, Dominum Episcopum sine morâ perlitteras suas monebunt." With what confidence, or what hope of the desired end, should I communicate such a case to a bishop whose own soundness of theological soundness was more than suspected? Should I not be guilty of a breach of my ordination vows if I did not protest against the admission of such a person to such a responsible post, and endeavour to "banish and drive away," by all lawful means, that person of the 18,000 clergy of this land on whom the censure and deprivation of one of the most learned and renowned seminaries of religious teaching in the world is yet in its full operation and effect, one who is already designated thereby as a setter forth of erroneous and strange doctrines? Again, I have sworn to be FAITHFUL to the cathedral church of Hereford. Faithful I could not be, either as to the maintenance of the doctrine, or the discipline of the Church in those respects already alluded to, or the welfare and unity of that Church, either in the cathedral body itself or in the diocese at large, under existing circumstances, if by any act of mine I promoted Dr. Hampden's elevation to the episcopal throne of that church and diocese. Faithful I have laboured to be in the restoration and the saving of its material and venerable fabric. Faithful, by God's help, I will strive to be, in obtaining for it that oblation of sound and holy doctrine which should ascend, together with the incense of prayer and praise, "in the beauty of holiness," untainted and unalloyed by any tincture of "philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."

'But your lordship may rely, there is another oath by which I have bound myself, which I have as yet overlooked; not so, my lord. Of my sentiments on the royal prerogative I have already put your Lordship in possession. When I warned you of the consequences of your appointment, of the tendency which it would produce to weaken the existing relations between Church and State, I fully recognised the just prerogative of the Crown; and when I thought I had not sufficiently dwelt upon it, I wrote a second time to make myself distinctly understood.

Nor is it only the sense of legal obligation which would constrain me to a dutiful regard to such observance. Few men have a greater cause to feel their duty in this respect, warmed by the sense of kindness and condescension from those of royal station, than myself. The memory of one who anxiously contemplated the future happiness and true glory of his successor, fixed indelibly those sentiments upon my heart. And, if for his sake only, who could to a long course of almost parental kindness add, in an affecting injunction, the expression of his wishes for my good upon his death-bed, I should never be found forgetful—even although I may never have taken in the present reign the oath of allegiance—of that loyalty and devotion to my Sovereign which is not less a duty of religion than the grateful and constitutional homage of an English heart. Forgive me, my lord, for the reflection on that death-bed injunction, if I say, that had it been observed—as but for political and party influences it would have been—your lordship, the Church, and the nation, would have been spared this most unhappy trial, the results of which, as I have already again and again foreboded to your lordship, it is impossible to foresee. Nor, under any circumstances, is it likely that the obligation of the oath of allegiance in my person will be infringed upon; its terms are, that "I will be faithful and bear true allegiance;" and, accordingly, the *Congé d'Elire* has these expressions, "requiring and commanding you, by the faith and allegiance by which you stand bound to us, to elect such a person for your bishop and pastor as may be devoted to God, and USEFUL and faithful to us and our KINGDOM." Would it be any proof of fidelity or true allegiance, my lord, to elect a person as "MEET TO BE ELECTED" who was the contrary to those requirements? And can it be possible that in the course of the *Divine service* in the *Chief Sanctuary of Almighty God* in the diocese, however named and recommended, a person should be "UNANIMOUSLY CHOSEN and ELECTED" in the awful falsification of these words, IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD, against the consciences of the unhappy electors, simply because the adviser of the Crown (for "the Crown can do no wrong") has, in his shortsightedness and ignorance of facts (to say the least), thought fit to name an objectionable person, the one of all the clergy of the land so disqualified; and, when warned of the consequences by the voices of the Primate, of thirteen bishops, and hosts of priests and deacons, clergy and laity by hundreds, of all shades of opinions in the Church, persisted in the reckless determination.

'In the words of an eminent writer of our Church, "All power is given unto edification, none to the overthrow and destruction of the Church"—*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, book viii. chap. 7; and the matter is, perhaps, placed in the true light and position by the learned author of *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*—Francis Mason; the whole of which is well worthy of your lordship's notice. I venture to supply a brief extract, book iv. chap 13, 1625:—

"*Philodoxus*.—You pretended to treat of Kings electing Bishops, and conferring of bishoprics, and now you ascribe not the election to Kings, but to the clergy, and claim only nomination for Kings?

"*Orthodoxus*.—The King's nomination is, with us, a fair beginning to the

election. Therefore, when he nominates any person to elect him, and gives, as I may say, the first vote for him.

“*Philodoxus*.—What kind of elections are those of your deans and chapters? ’Tis certain they can’t be called free elections, since nothing is to be done without the King’s previous authority.

“*Orthodoxus*.—The freedom of election doth not exclude the King’s sacred authority, but *force and tyranny* only. If any unworthy person should be forced upon them against their will, or the clergy should be constrained to give their voices by force and threatening, such an election cannot be said to be free. But if the King do nominate a worthy person according to the laws, as our Kings have used to do, and give them authority to choose him, there is no reason why this may not be called a free election; for here is no force or violence used.

“*Philodoxus*.—But if the King, deceived by *undeserved recommendations*, should happen to propose to the clergy a person unlearned, or of ill morals, or otherwise manifestly unworthy of that function, what’s to be done then?

“*Orthodoxus*.—Our Kings are wont to proceed in these cases maturely and cautiously, I mean with the utmost care and prudence; and hence it comes to pass that the Church of England is at this time in such a flourishing condition.

“*Philodoxus*.—Since they are but men they are liable to human weakness; and, therefore, what’s to be done if such a case should happen?

“*Orthodoxus*.—If the electors could make sufficient proof of such crimes or incapacities, I think it were becoming them to *represent the same to the King, with all due humility, modesty, and duty, humbly beseeching his Majesty, out of his own clemency, to take care of the interest of the widowed Church; and our Princes are so famous for their piety and condescension, that I doubt not that his Majesty would graciously answer their pious petition—and nominate another unexceptionable person, agreeable to all their wishes. Thus a mutual affection would be kept up between the bishop and his church.*”

“Nor is this a mere supposition, but there are instances in the history of this kingdom of such judicious reconsideration of an undesirable appointment. I will cite but one from Burnet’s ‘History of his own Times,’ A.D. 1693, vol. iv. p. 289. London, 1733 :—

“The state of Ireland leads me to insert here a very particular instance of the Queen’s pious care in disposing of bishoprics. Lord Sidney was so far engaged in the interest of a great family in Ireland, that he was too easily wrought on to recommend a branch of it to a vacant see. The representation was made with an undue character of the person; so the Queen granted it. But when she understood that he lay under a very bad character, she wrote a letter in her own hand to Lord Sidney, letting him know what she had heard, and ordered him to call for six Irish Bishops, whom she named to him, and to require them to certify to her their opinion of that person. They all agreed that he laboured under an ill-fame, and till that was examined they did not think it proper to promote him; so that matter was let fall. I do not name the person, for I intend not to leave a blemish on him, but set this down as an example fit to be imitated by Christian Princes.”

“But, alas! remonstrance seems unheeded, and if our venerable Primate and thirteen Bishops have raised their united voice of warning and entreaty to no purpose, it is no marvel that my humble supplication should have pleaded in vain, for time—for investigation—for some regard to our consciences—some consideration for our painful and delicate position.

“The time draws near—on Tuesday next the *semblance* of an election is to be exhibited. I venture to assure your lordship that I could not undertake to say that it would be an unanimous election; I was bold enough



to affirm that it would not be unanimous; and I, in my turn, received the intimation and the caution, I will not say *the threat*—that the law must be vindicated. Already have I assured your lordship that the principle on which this painful affair is regarded, is that of the most solemn religious responsibility; thousands regard it in this light. I have already told you, my lord, that the watchword of such is this—"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." I have anxiously implored your lordship to pause—to avert the blow. I have long since told you the truth. I have endeavoured to prevent, by every means in my power, the commotion which has arisen, and the necessity of the performance of a painful duty. I hoped the *Congé d'Elire* would not be issued *until a fair inquiry and investigation had been instituted*. A suit has been commenced in the ecclesiastical courts—why not have awaited its issue? When the *Congé d'Elire* did appear, I at once presumed, humbly but faithfully, though I stood alone, to petition the Crown; and now, when I am officially informed that "her Majesty has not been pleased to issue any commands thereupon," I feel it to be my bounden duty, after a full and calm deliberation on the whole subject, having counted the cost, but remembering the words of Him whose most unworthy servant I am—"He that loveth houses or lands more than me is not worthy of me"—loving my children dearly, and ardently desiring to complete the noble work which I have for seven years laboured to promote, yet not forgetting that there is "an hour of death and a day of judgment," when I trust, through the merits of my Redeemer, to be allowed to look up with hope, that I may be considered by the intercessions of mercy and pity to have been faithful in the hour of trial, to have "fought the good fight, to have kept the faith, to have finished *my* course,"—believing that I risk much, and shall incur your lordship's heavy displeasure, who may, if you will, direct the sword of power against me and mine—being certain that I preclude myself from that which might otherwise have been my lot, and expecting that I shall bring down upon myself the abuse and blame of some—I say, my lord, having fully counted the cost, having weighed *the sense of bounden duty* in the one scale against the consequences in the other, I have come to the deliberate resolve, that on Tuesday next no earthly consideration shall induce me to give my vote in the chapter of Hereford cathedral for Dr. Hampden's elevation to the See of Hereford.

'I have the honour to be, my Lord,

'Your Lordship's faithful humble servant,

'JOHN MEREWETHER, Dean of Hereford.

'Hereford, Dec. 22.'

#### IX.—LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S REPLY.

'Woburn Abbey, December 25.

'Sir,—I have had the honour to receive your letter of the 22d inst., in which you intimate to me your intention of violating the law.

'I have the honour to be your obedient servant,

'J. RUSSELL.

'The Very Rev. the Dean of Hereford.'

## NOTICES.

THE Spottiswood Society has just completed the first part of Bishop Forbes's '*Considerationes Modestæ et Pacificæ Controversiarum de Justificatione, Purgatorio, Invocatione Sanctorum et Christo Mediatore, Eucharistiæ,*' &c. The Latin text is accompanied by a translation into English, very carefully executed, and the numerous references are verified and completed in a manner almost as creditable to the patience of the Editor as his threading the mazes of Bellarmine, Paræus, and fifty other laborious controversialists, is to that of the writer. The present volume only extends to the first three books : 1. of justifying faith, 2. of the formal cause of justification, 3. on the questions of the uncertainty, mutability, and inequality of justice (the justified state). It would be premature to review the work until at least the whole subject of justification is completed; but there is matter in the present volume to occupy an ordinary thinker in mastering it at least until the next comes out. The views of numerous writers are stated and balanced with wonderful accuracy, and each is referred to his own point of view with a fairness rarely to be met with. In short, any one who wishes to know what has been thought and said on this great and difficult controversy, can do no better than consult Bishop Forbes, who has waded through the whole of it, and marked almost every point that is worthy of attention. Nor are his labours superseded by later controversial writings on the subject. They may help the reader to a more speedy decision of controverted points, and mark out a more single line of thought, but they will not equally answer the purpose of enabling him to understand various writers, and to separate the true from the false in their statements. Some may think this scarce worth while, at least as regards the 'more rigid Protestants;' and yet our view of the course of faith, and the merciful dealing of God, with our weak and prejudiced understandings, must always be very incomplete if we will not condescend to such investigations. And, perhaps, it may be said that most minds have some shreds of prejudice clinging to them which would be better cleared away by the discovery of their origin than blindly swept off by the adoption of a wholly new way of thinking.

'A Systematic Analysis of Bishop Butler's Treatise on Analogy.' By John Wilkinson, B.A., of Merton College, Oxford, Curate of Exmouth. (Oxford, Parker.) Framed upon an excellent model, and apparently very ably carried out, so as to present the reader with each of the great philosopher's reasonings, in a distinct form, together with what is too often omitted in works of this sort, its place in the main body of the argument. The only desideratum which we could feel,—one, however, which perhaps we have no right to expect from the analysis before us,—is that a greater perspicuity of style should be attempted, even at the cost of departure sometimes from the author's own modes of expressing himself,

which, it is impossible to deny, are not always the most happily chosen for the conveyance of his ideas, however natural, viewed as exponents of the particular process by which this great work was elaborated.

Perhaps the most important book of the quarter is Mr. Keble's volume, 'Sermons Academical and Occasional.' (J. H. Parker.) They range over a quarter of a century: and, which can be said probably of no other living theological writer—they are uniform. The author's mind certainly has grown and expanded; but this growth implies a succession and enlargement, not a change. The particular charm about them is their even, smooth, soothing character. They breathe quite an atmosphere of calm. Dignity, however, and the consciousness of power, are implied in their character: it is the still, unruffled character of conviction and of an intense hold and living upon truth. We attach too ordinarily the notion of weakness to calm. Mr. Keble's is the calm of a settled tranquillity which arises after inquiry and conviction: some minds are tranquil only because apathetic or incapable. These sermons are a treasure, and fit for all time; while the Preface, 'On the present position of English Churchmen,' which has attracted most attention, has only a temporary or at least a local, however high, value. It is a careful and striking application of Bishop Butler's argument to the actual state and case of the Church of England: and of course takes, as the argument from analogy *must* take, the lowest ground. But while rhetorically the most doubtful, we all know that logically analogy is the most powerful weapon of the reasoning art. Still the argument from analogy, simply as a profound argument, is not fit for the popular reader; and, thankful as we are for everything which comes from Mr. Keble's pen, we may admit this. It is probably from such a feeling that we have heard people speak of this Preface as too apologetical, and that it ought to have taken, or rather added, some constructive argument in favour of the English Church. So to say only shows complete ignorance of the nature of Bishop Butler's argument, which can only be defensive: but it will serve to show that while the Sermons bear a very popular aspect, the Preface is more esoteric.

The Bishop of Exeter's brilliant letter on 'Scripture Readers,' (Murray,) has been effaced by his still more celebrated one on the Hampden case. We are disposed to take his Lordship's view: at the best all that Scripture Readers can do ordained Clergy can do better; and it is premature to try a new order till we have laboured to recruit the old force; and who shall say that anything like serious attempts to increase the Clergy have been made in responsible quarters? This single fact, together with the less than dubious parentage of the scheme, must be decisive.

A 'cabinet,' and slightly lopped, edition of 'Gulliver's Travels,' has appeared as a volume of one of Burns' series. It is a pretty book, and has some very clever woodcuts by Hablot Browne, the 'Phiz' of Dickens, &c. One of them, placed at p. 116, and lettered as the illustration of the voyage to Laputa, should have been at p. 140, to which in fact it refers.

'The Juvenile Englishman's Library,' (Masters,) has received additions, and judicious ones, in the shape of 'Stories from Froissart,' by Mr. Dunster, and an admirable volume, of great practical importance, from Mr. Neale, 'Stories from Heathen Mythology,' *for the use of Christian children.*

'The Adventures of a Fly,' and 'Simple Tales for the Young,' (Burns,) we find tell with those for whom they are written: the best test of value.

'Original Tales and Legends,' (Burns,) by Mr. W. B. Flower, has the same pious object as Mr. Neale's. To say that Mr. Flower has succeeded in a line so thoroughly his own as Mr. Neale's, is no slight praise.

'The Progress of the Church of England since the Reformation,' (Masters,) is an article reprinted from the 'Ecclesiastic,' which we admired at the time of publication, and welcome in this more permanent shape. It shows that we have constantly been drifting for three centuries since the Reformation: but that the tide has always swept in one, and that a more catholic, direction. The inference is obvious.

'Beauties of German Literature,' (Burns,) is a volume of the 'Select Library.' Heavy, we thought, but readable with an effort. Of the two schools, as in literature so in art, our affections are rather for the imaginative literature of Italy.

'Balaam and his Ass: a Poem,' (Houlston & Stoneman,) a vituperation of the Church of England by a Dissenter. Archbishop Laud observed of one who was guilty of a similar performance in which the same names occurred, that it 'displayed more of the ass than the prophet.'

A beautiful Edition of Watts's Hymns 'Divine and Moral Songs,' (Van Voorst,) has appeared sumptuously enriched with wooden block drawings by Cope, cut by Thompson. The artist, always pleasing, often inimitable, succeeds better in the quiet vignettes than in the more ambitious subjects. Compare the delightful little subject of p. 35 with the thin unsatisfactory group at p. 33, or with that at p. 88. The province of xylography is not the very highest, however important. The cuts are well worked by the printer, to whom is owing more than half the effect of this particular art. But what thin meagre stuff are the 'Songs' thus enshrined!

'History of the Hebrew Monarchy,' (Chapman,) is perhaps the most complete and plain-spoken attempt to force an indigenous rationalism on the English public, which has yet appeared. It is quite of the school of Ewald, written possibly with greater profanity. If there were not buyers for this class of books, such a series of them would not appear. We have already called attention to the fact, which every day makes more prominent, that a flood of practical, and, in a way, critical, and scholarly unbelief is setting in. The present writer, and with reason, suppresses his name.

The first volume of the Posthumous works of Dr. Chalmers, 'Daily Scripture Readings,' has been published by Mr. Constable, of Edinburgh. It is quite clear that they were never intended for, and are utterly unworthy of, publication. We can only attribute their appearance to some sordid purpose which does now and then appear in the religion established north of the Tweed.

Mr. W. G. Humphry, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London, has published a short 'Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles,' (J. W. Parker,) which is judicious and sound. It is quite eclectic in character, and incorporates the researches of the more respectable German commentators, such as

Olshausen. We observe that not only are S. Chrysostom and S. Augustine systematically shorn of their reverential prefix, but occasionally we hear of 'Paul' and 'Stephen,'—pp. 72, 73. Mr. Humphry we are quite sure does not intend this to be pointed; but however familiar the practice may be to students of foreign theology, 'Jerome' and 'Gregory' have a strange sound to English ears, and were never employed by the great English divines.

'Short Readings, Essays and Sermons,' by Mr. Woodward, of Fethard, (Hatchard,) are far above the run of 'Evangelical' writings; they show a grasp of literature, and largeness and fairness of view very satisfactory. The writer was a friend of Alexander Knox; and, with some of the peculiarities, has all the amiability of that remarkable person.

Mrs. Hamilton Gray's 'History of Rome for Young Persons,' (Hatchard,) is a very ingenious attempt to bring the recent discoveries of the critical school, into working competition with the miserable Goldsmiths and Pinnocks of our youth. Subsequent to each chapter is, what is called an after-chapter, on subjects literary, pictorial, topographical, or the like. We do not like this device ourselves; it seems alternating amusement and instruction on the beef-and-hard-dumpling plan. But it saves trouble, we suppose, to teachers and taught.

'A few words on Submission to the Catholic Church,' by a Recent Convert [Mr. Alexander Chirol]; 'Apostacy,' a Sermon, &c., by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett (Cleaver); 'A Statement of Facts,' by Alexander Chirol, B.A. (Burns); 'A Reply to a Statement of Facts,' by Mr. Bennett (Cleaver); 'Remarks on Mr. Bennett's Reply to a Statement,' by Mr. Chirol (Burns); 'Conversion, a letter to Mr. Chirol,' by the Right Rev. N. Wiseman, D.D., &c. (Burns); 'Strictures on a Sermon entitled "Apostacy,"' by Caustic (T. W. Saunders); 'An Examination of Mr. Bennett's Theory,' by Mr. R. A. Gordon (Rivingtons); 'Some Account of the Reasons of my Conversion' [by Mr. John Gordon]; 'The Spirit of Romanism, a Sermon,' by Mr. Geo. Nugee (Cleaver). There: we believe this to be an accurate list of the various publications 'in reference to a late event at St. Paul's, Knightsbridge.' Mr. Alexander Chirol—apparently a person of small importance and very hazy judgment—Curate of St. Paul's, is 'converted' in the absence of the incumbent, Mr. Bennett. Mr. Bennett preaches a straightforward plain-spoken sermon, never, we judge from the composition, written for publication, and by no means, let us add, calculated for publication, in which he applies the term, apostacy, to the 'late event'; a term eminently inapplicable to it, as Mr. Robert Gordon in his very sensible publication shows. The publication of Mr. Bennett's sermon—a good sermon enough and suitable to his congregation, but not suitable to the inflammable temper of the public, or of the Church—is the signal for a regular riot. And we get involved in excommunications and protests, in extracts and letters and hints, and churchwardens, and curates, and ladies of title, and curates' wives, and Sicilian priests, and prosy school-masters, and 'recent converts,' Mr. New and his friend Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Gordon's

brother, and Mr. Gordon's brother's wife, together with a by-play of letters advertised and then withdrawn, retractations, and explanations, and apologies, and appeals to the Bishop, too numerous and too intricate to detail, the very thought of all which complication sets the memory whirling. In the midst of all these warring winds, portly Dr. Wiseman steps in and writes the very weakest pamphlet of the set—which is saying not a little. Happily more important matters have attracted public attention; but at last the various authors got to bill-sticking and placarding. Doubtless all the parties concerned are as heartily sick and tired of the whole proceeding as we have felt all along.

'The Churchman's Diary,' (Masters,) is the best work of the kind which has appeared. The 'English Churchman's Kalendar,' from the same publisher, is also to be recommended.

A press of matter of immediate importance has compelled us to postpone notices of many books published during the quarter.

---

ERRATUM.—Vol. XIII. p. 310, line 18 from bottom, for 'these seven ultimately refrained from voting on either side' read, 'one of these seven,' &c.